

DTIC FILE COPY
AD-A227 516



**U.S. Army Research Institute
for the Behavioral and Social Sciences**

Research Report 1568

Women in Combat: An Overview of the Implications for Recruiting

Mary Sue Hay and Charles G. Middlestead

DTIC
ELECTE
OCT 05 1990
S E D
Go

July 1990

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited

90 10 04 101

U.S. ARMY RESEARCH INSTITUTE FOR THE BEHAVIORAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

A Field Operating Agency Under the Jurisdiction
of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel

EDGAR M. JOHNSON
Technical Director

JON W. BLADES
COL, IN
Commanding

Technical review by

Timothy W. Elig
Laurel W. Oliver

Accession For	
NTIS GRA&I	<input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/>
DTIC TAB	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unannounced	<input type="checkbox"/>
Justification	
By _____	
Distribution/	
Availability Codes	
Dist	Avail and/or Special
A-1	



NOTICES

DISTRIBUTION: Primary distribution of this report has been made by ARL. Please address correspondence concerning distribution of reports to: U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences, ATTN: PERI-POX, 500 Eisenhower Ave., Alexandria, Virginia 22333-5600.

FINAL DISPOSITION: This report may be destroyed when it is no longer needed. Please do not return it to the U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences.

NOTE: The findings in this report are not to be construed as an official Department of the Army position, unless so designated by other authorized documents.

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

Form Approved
OMB No. 0704-0188

1a. REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION Unclassified			1b. RESTRICTIVE MARKINGS ---	
2a. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION AUTHORITY ---			3. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY OF REPORT Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.	
2b. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE ---			5. MONITORING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S) ---	
4. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S) Research Report 1568			7a. NAME OF MONITORING ORGANIZATION ---	
6a. NAME OF PERFORMING ORGANIZATION U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences		6b. OFFICE SYMBOL (if applicable) PERI-R	7b. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) ---	
6c. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) 5001 Eisenhower Avenue Alexandria, VA 22333-5600			9. PROCUREMENT INSTRUMENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER ---	
8a. NAME OF FUNDING/SPONSORING ORGANIZATION ---		8b. OFFICE SYMBOL (if applicable) ---	10. SOURCE OF FUNDING NUMBERS	
8c. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) ---		PROGRAM ELEMENT NO. 62785A	PROJECT NO. 791	TASK NO. 2105 WORK UNIT ACCESSION NO. H01
11. TITLE (Include Security Classification) Women in Combat: An Overview of the Implications for Recruiting				
12. PERSONAL AUTHOR(S) Hay, Mary Sue; and Middlestead, Charles G.				
13a. TYPE OF REPORT Final	13b. TIME COVERED FROM 78/09 TO 90/05	14. DATE OF REPORT (Year, Month, Day) 1990, July	15. PAGE COUNT	
16. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION ---				
17. COSATI CODES			18. SUBJECT TERMS (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number)	
FIELD	GROUP	SUB-GROUP	Women Defense	
05	08		Combat Army recruiting	
05	09		Military personnel	
19. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number) This report presents an overview of recruiting issues involved if the combat exclusion policy for women in the U.S. Army is changed. Historically, women have had no explicit combat role, but have often moved into de facto combat roles when circumstances demanded. Eliminating the combat exclusion would change women's role from combatant by chance to combatant by design. Attitude research on military personnel indicates mixed opinions on women in combat; however, national opinion polls and attitude surveys suggest that public approval is increasing. Research indicates several factors related to women's nontraditional occupational choices: commitment to being in the labor force, higher ability, higher educational expectations, and approval by significant others. The cases of Canada and Norway are cited as examples of other countries' experiences in opening combat roles to women. A number of arguments against women in combat are presented, together with favorable views to provide a balanced portrayal of the issues. Research directions are proposed and current survey research is described.				
20. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY OF ABSTRACT <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> UNCLASSIFIED/UNLIMITED <input type="checkbox"/> SAME AS RPT. <input type="checkbox"/> DTIC USERS			21. ABSTRACT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION Unclassified	
22a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE INDIVIDUAL Mary Sue Hay			22b. TELEPHONE (Include Area Code) (202) 274-5610	22c. OFFICE SYMBOL PERI-RG

Research Report 1568

Women in Combat: An Overview of the Implications for Recruiting

Mary Sue Hay and Charles G. Middlestead

**Manpower and Personnel Policy Research Group
Curtis L. Gilroy, Chief**

**Manpower and Personnel Research Laboratory
Zita M. Simutis, Acting Director**

**U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences
5001 Eisenhower Avenue, Alexandria, Virginia 22333-5600**

**Office, Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel
Department of the Army**

July 1990

**Army Project Number
2Q162785A791**

Manpower, Personnel, and Training

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

FOREWORD

The U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences (ARI) conducts research to enhance recruiting success and to develop more cost-effective recruiting policies and practices for the Army. Recent public debate on the possibility of removing laws and policies that restrict women from combat roles makes it necessary for the Army to evaluate the impact of such a change on recruiting. This paper attempts to provide some insight into the issues that would face the U.S. Army, especially the U.S. Army Recruiting Command (USAREC) and its field recruiters, if the combat exclusion policies were modified.

This work is part of the mission of the Manpower and Personnel Policy Research Group (MPPRG) of ARI's Manpower and Personnel Research Laboratory to conduct research to improve the Army's capability to effectively and efficiently recruit its personnel. MPPRG was requested to include research on female prospects in its FY 90 research program by USAREC and was specifically requested to examine the issue of recruiting women for combat arms for the Director of Military Personnel Management, Office Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel (ODCSFER), on 29 Jan 90. An initial version of this report was provided to ODCSPER and to USAREC on 7 Feb 90.

This report provides an overview of attitudes on the role of women in the U.S. Army and an understanding of the possible impact if policies were changed to allow women to enter the combat arms branches of the Army. It highlights areas of concern for USAREC overall and for individual recruiters if they were called upon to recruit women for the combat arms.



EDGAR M. JOHNSON
Technical Director

WOMEN IN COMBAT: AN OVERVIEW OF THE IMPLICATIONS FOR RECRUITING

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Requirement:

The requirement for this report grew out of public debate on the role of women in the U.S. military services. Information on the potential need to recruit women for expanded combat roles was required in light of a bill introduced in Congress that would require the Army to recruit women for combat for a 4-year trial period.

Eliminating the combat exclusion provisions for the U.S. Army would have direct implications for the nature and effectiveness of recruiting policies and programs. While past research has provided the U.S. Army Recruiting Command (USAREC) with information that has been vital to the success of its recruiting function, the possibility of allowing women to enlist in the Infantry, Field Artillery, and Armor branches would present new challenges at the national level and for individual recruiters. The present research was designed to provide Army policy makers and analysts with an overview of the major issues that relate to recruiting women for service in combat roles.

Procedure:

Information about opinions, perceptions, and facts concerning this possible role for women was obtained through bibliographies and databases. A computer-aided search for related literature was conducted through the social and behavioral science, DTIC, and NTIS databases. A search of the public opinion poll database maintained by The Roper Center, University of Connecticut, was also conducted. Existing survey data were reviewed and analyzed for relevant information. Empirical data from ARI databases that were used included New Recruit Survey (NRS), Youth Attitude Tracking Study (YATS), Army Communications Objectives Measurement System (ACOMS), Recruit Experience Tracking Survey (RETS), and Career Decision Survey (CDS).

Results:

There exists an historical precedent both in the United States and internationally for women participating in combat. In the United States women have taken part in combat situations for two reasons: (1) because their duties have involved some combat exposure, as in the cases of Army nurses and the Signal Corps;

and (2) through happenstance, because they have been brought into the battle as a result of uncontrollable circumstances (as in the case of CPT Linda Bray in Operation Just Cause).

While there is no precedent in the United States of recruiting, training, or assigning women for direct combat roles, other countries such as Canada, Norway, and the Soviet Union have employed women in combat roles with varying degrees of success. In 1987 the Canadian Forces commenced the Combat Related Employment for Women (CREW) study on the effects of mixed gender combat forces. Women seem to be performing acceptably in noninfantry positions, but have been unable to complete infantry training. Norway, on the other hand, has experienced greater success in their recruiting program for women in combat roles.

U.S. public opinion and that of many authors and military personnel is mixed concerning the viability of allowing women to serve in the combat arms. However, data from national opinion polls suggest that approval for permitting women to hold combat roles has increased during the last decade. A full spectrum of viewpoints ranging from traditional psychological arguments to performance-oriented physiological arguments exists, with no apparent consensus. Major arguments, both pro and con, are listed and referenced.

USAREC would have to develop recruiting strategies to address the opinions, perceptions, and facts to the satisfaction of the American population at large, as well as to the satisfaction of individual prospects (both male and female), if recruiting women into the combat arms were to be accepted and successfully implemented.

Utilization of Findings:

This paper provides the Army with an overview of the current status of this important issue as well as several options for future planning. The research suggests that any stigma of women serving in combat roles would need to be removed from public perceptions. This could be facilitated by identifying negative and positive perceptions, opinions, and facts, and developing public relations programs to move public attitudes toward a more favorable view.

Recruiting programs would have to be modified to ensure female accessions if even an experimental program of recruitment for the combat arms were to be implemented. Information needed to accomplish a successful experimental program could be obtained by incorporating new questions into existing instruments. Both the 1990 High School Survey of Youth and Parents and the 1990 New Recruit Survey will be used to gather data about the impact perceptions of women in combat could have on propensity to enlist.

New questions designed to test some of the perceptions of women in combat and measure various recruiting incentives have been developed and are presented in this paper.

WOMEN IN COMBAT: AN OVERVIEW OF THE IMPLICATIONS FOR RECRUITING

CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
Research Issues	2
Setting the Stage for Change.	3
WOMEN IN COMBAT.	4
Women in Combat Versus Women as Combatants.	5
ATTITUDE RESEARCH ON WOMEN IN COMBAT	7
Attitudes of Military Personnel	7
Public Opinion Polls.	10
Related Attitudinal Data from Surveys	14
RESEARCH FROM ANALOGOUS SETTINGS	16
Women in Nontraditional Occupations	16
Women in the Military Forces of Other Countries	18
Women in Other Branches of the U.S. Military.	20
ISSUES FACING RECRUITERS	21
The Argument Against Women in Combat.	21
Countering the Negative Views	22
The Feminization of the Workforce	24
Recruiting Focus.	25
RESEARCH DIRECTIONS.	26
Future Survey Research.	26
Studying Civilian Organizations with Parallels to the Military.	27
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS.	28
REFERENCES	29
APPENDIX A. MATERIALS FROM THE ROPER CENTER	A-1
B. ITEMS FROM THE 1990 SURVEY OF HIGH SCHOOL YOUTH AND PARENTS.	B-1

CONTENTS (Continued)

	Page
APPENDIX C. SUMMER 1990 SUPPLEMENT TO THE USAREC NEW RECRUIT SURVEY.	C-1

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Responses to the question of allowing women to hold combat jobs.	12
2. Approval ratings in 1982 of women being assigned to selected military jobs	13

WOMEN IN COMBAT:
AN OVERVIEW OF THE IMPLICATIONS FOR RECRUITING

Introduction

By law and by policy, women in the U.S. military forces are currently excluded from military duties involving combat. Recently, however, the possibility of modifying these restrictions has been discussed, and it has been proposed that a limited number of women be admitted to the Infantry, Field Artillery, and Armor branches of the U.S. Army as a test of the feasibility of utilizing women in combat. Because this is a situation which has never before arisen, there is little information about the possible consequences--especially those consequences which have an impact on attracting new recruits to the U.S. Army, and specifically attracting women to combat positions. This paper attempts to provide some insight into the possible results of removing the combat exclusion for women. We note here that neither the question of women's competence in the combat role, nor the issue of the possible dangers of combat to women, is our focus in this report, except as these concerns influence the recruiting issue.

At the end of FY 1989, there were 73,780 women serving as enlisted soldiers in the U.S. Army. During FY 1989, 17,813 women (14.7 percent of all accessions) went on active duty as enlisted soldiers in 214 of the 258 Army Military Occupational Specialties (MOS). At issue are the changes that would result from opening the remaining 44 MOSs to women on either a permanent or trial basis.

It is not our purpose here to argue either for or against eliminating the combat exclusion. Whether or not women should be allowed to enter combat is a political and social question which exceeds the scope of this report. We do, however, describe some of the conflicting viewpoints on the issue, on grounds that "to describe actual values and attitudes is a legitimate scientific enterprise" (Cotton, 1979, p. 88), and because we believe that an awareness of current viewpoints could be important to the issue of recruiting.

The young adults who are potential prospects for Army enlistment are embedded in an American society where the issues of women in combat are increasingly being discussed and where the daily news often includes stories about women in the military. Indeed, the topic has become so "mainstream" that readers have recently written to "Dear Abby" about it (Future female soldier, 1990; Letter battle breaks out, 1990), and McCall's has conducted a reader poll (Dusky, 1990). Given this atmosphere, which cannot help but have an impact on enlistment decisions, recruiting strategists could benefit from being aware of the issues and arguments underlying the question of women in combat.

For these reasons, we provide information on a number of different areas related to women in combat: background and history, research on attitudes and opinions, current pro and con

arguments, examples from the military forces of other countries, and research suggestions. Our premise is that only by grasping the broad picture of the environment within which recruiting takes place can the U.S. Army Recruiting Command (USAREC) effectively formulate policies and strategies for managing any change in the combat exclusion policy.

Thus, we take as our starting point the possibility that combat exclusion policies could, in fact, be modified at some point--either permanently or on a trial basis in order to conduct a test. If such a change were to take place, it would very likely have some impact on Army recruiting, particularly the recruiting of women. Our purpose, then, is to explore that impact and to suggest ways of maximizing recruiting effectiveness, given the existence of a policy which permits women in combat.

Research Issues

Much of the discussion in this paper is somewhat speculative, because it is not derived from research directed at the question of recruiting women for combat roles. Since women have always been excluded from these positions, there is very little research which directly addresses the issue of recruiting women for combat jobs. The question, when it has been asked at all, has typically been a hypothetical one of the form, "If women were allowed in combat, would you be in favor or opposed?" This type of question requires respondents to guess what their opinions would be in a situation which they know is neither genuine nor likely (at least until recently) to occur in the foreseeable future.

Consequently, we must also draw on research in other areas to gain some understanding of the concerns and possible behaviors of potential recruits. To do this, we can look at several analogous situations: women in nontraditional (i.e., traditionally male dominated) occupations; women in the military forces of other countries; women in other branches of the U.S. military; and women in organizations which have some parallels to the military, such as police forces. These are all potential sources of information which could help in investigating the likely impact on recruiting of allowing women to enlist for combat assignments.

In addition, we can examine the results of public opinion polls, and we can draw some inferences from existing data on new Army recruits and civilian youth. A number of surveys have been conducted to determine the motivations and attitudes of the latter groups with respect to the U.S. military generally and the Army specifically. Although only one deals directly with this question, it is possible to acquire some sense of what the attitudes might be by looking at related questions.

These, then, are some of the approaches that can be taken. They are, of course, in addition to seeking information that immediately addresses the present problem: assessing attitudes toward the use of women in combat and the impact of those attitudes on recruiting for the combat arms branches.

It is important to note that sometimes changes in attitudes follow changes in the law, rather than preceding them. Examples include desegregation, mandatory seat belt usage, and women in nontraditional jobs. In all cases, the widespread initial controversy and/or opposition has been tempered somewhat over time, producing attitude shifts toward a more favorable view.

On the other hand, it is not always the case that simple exposure leads to approval. For example, a study by Oliver (1982) focused on the performance of male and female soldiers in work groups on an eleven day field training exercise. Attitudes of the soldiers as they related to the proportion of women in the group and the size of the group were measured and results indicated that the proportion of women in the work group was significantly related to male attitudes. The men's attitudes became less positive as the proportion of women in the work group increased, while the size of the total group was not related to the attitudinal scores. Note, however, that these male soldiers were exposed to increasing numbers of women soldiers, rather than being exposed to women soldiers over increasing periods of time. Thus, we might not expect to find an immediate move toward more favorable attitudes, given the short time period involved.

Intensely held beliefs and attitudes are, indeed, very resistant to change. Sentiments about the proper roles of women are deeply rooted, widely shared, and often unyielding, even given decisive evidence that women are functioning well in nontraditional situations (e.g., see Heilman, Block, Martell, & Simon, 1989). By definition, attitudes are relatively stable. Consequently, we cannot expect rapid shifts to occur. Rather, we would expect longer-term changes in attitudes, especially in a controversial area such as women in combat.

Setting the Stage for Change

Since the advent of the All-Volunteer Force (AVF) in 1973, the United States has learned that "the type of recruits entering the armed forces does make a difference" in terms of manpower quantity and quality (Moskos, 1986, p. 15). Today, the AVF is credited with being a better force than its conscription-based predecessor. It is, however, a different kind of force than the one that existed in the 1960's and before: it is more female. The trend of increased female participation in the services is due, in part, to changes in law and in the marketplace. From 1948 until the enactment of the Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1966, the proportion of female enlistees was restricted to two percent of the total enlisted strength (Binkin and Eitelberg, 1986). Pressures from increasing strength needs

due to the demands of the Vietnam War facilitated the reassessment of the role of women in the military.

In the early 1970's the Gates Commission explored the effects of eliminating the draft and replacing it with an all-volunteer system that would be "guided by marketplace standards" (Moskos, 1986, p. 15). Once the draft was abolished, marketplace economics took over and it became clear that the role of women in the military would have to expand because of the decline in male accessions. John G. Kester, former Deputy Assistant to the Secretary of the Army and special assistant to the Secretary of Defense, suggests that "women have made the difference between success and failure in meeting overall recruiting figures" in the All-Volunteer Force (1986, p. 301). In ten years, from the mid-1970's through the mid-1980's, the percentage of female enlistees increased from five percent to over eleven percent of the total force. In the Army alone, from 1972 through 1983 the proportion of female enlistees rose from 1.2 percent to 12.5 percent of total recruits (Binkin and Eitelberg, 1986). With this increase in the number of women entering the services, new demands have arisen for more equality in the kinds of work assignments open to them.

Even with the dramatic increase of women in the AVF, they still have been excluded from assignment to certain kinds of duties. In the AVF men can "volunteer" to serve (e.g., visit a recruiter and explore options), but once enlisted they can still be involuntarily assigned to certain kinds of duties, including combat. Men can also specifically volunteer for certain kinds of training and hazardous duty assignments. Women, on the other hand, cannot volunteer or be assigned to all of the same work areas as men because of the combat exclusion laws and policies. Moskos (1990) suggests that there is a very critical difference between being allowed to volunteer for combat duty and being assigned to combat duty. Effective recruiting strategies might depend upon which situation (if either) became the case.

Women in Combat

Modern history contains numerous specific examples of women serving their nations in a variety of wartime capacities, including combat in modes such as offensive, defensive, terrorist, and espionage operations. For example, during World War II the Soviet Union employed over one million women in direct combat roles including snipers, riflemen, machinegunners, tankers, pilots, and air force crewmembers (Goldman & Wiegand, 1982). The United States can be cited as a typical example of how women have served in Army roles such as nurses, doctors, military police officers, and communications technicians. In each of these roles they have had to face the dangers of being captured, injured, or killed, despite the fact that they were not serving in "combat jobs." While women have often functioned in various combat-support capacities, the American public seems to

hold somewhat mixed opinions about whether they should serve in combat roles.

Quinn and Toulson (1988) presented the topic of women in combat to a conference in 1985, discussing both sides of the issue. They point out that historical accounts of women in combat are rare, but in more recent times women have served in roles such as combatants in conventional, partisan, and guerilla operations in Soviet forces during WWII. They go on to mention that women have been known to engage in combat when their country has been invaded or undergone revolutionary change. It is interesting to note that there are records of women entering front line positions to replace their injured or killed spouses.

Quinn and Toulson include several issues that are viewed as being pro or con regarding the entry of women into combat roles. The pro arguments center around equal rights and responsibility of citizenship issues, career development opportunities, and the risk to women of suffering the same injuries as male soldiers because of the changing dynamics of modern warfare. Contrary arguments are positioned from traditional and cohesion and/or effectiveness points of view.

During the Grenada invasion of 1983, the example of female military nurses and soldiers serving in a combat zone demonstrated that women can serve in dangerous environments. It also uncovered a command and control problem that affected the efficiency of the mission. This is the case of the "ping-pong nurses" (Stewart, 1988) who were assigned to serve in the medical facilities and other units in Grenada. Due to a lack of clarity in communications, these women were not allowed to join up with their respective units because they were not permitted in a combat zone. Instead they were flown back to the United States. Once they arrived in the U.S. they were turned around again to be flown back to the combat zone. Eventually they were allowed to disembark and report to their duty assignments, but only after much wasted time and effort was spent in transit.

There can be little debate as to whether women have served in combat during periods of crisis; they have often shared in the burdens of ensuring successful accomplishment of military missions. Few, if any authorities deny that women have been involved in combat actions; history speaks for itself. But it is less clear how women would function as members of the combat arms branches because there is limited historical experience from which policy planners can draw.

Women in Combat versus Women as Combatants

Opinions on the idea of women in combat range from those who cite the traditional list of reasons why women should not participate in combat (e.g., Reed, 1990) to those who look favorably on having an expanded role for women in the military (e.g., Holm, 1982). There does not seem to be a clear consensus

among authors, journalists, and elected officials about the role that women should play in combat, possibly because the distinction between serving in combat in general, and serving in the three combat arms branches of the Army in particular, is not always clear. For instance, Senator John Warner is quoted in Army Times (Maze, 1990) as stating,

"When we give them [women in military support jobs] responsibilities, be it communications, intelligence or military police, which are likely to take them into the proximity of a battle situation where they are accepting the same risks as the combat infantryman, then I think their training has to be equivalent,"

and further saying "I do not think there was any distinction between the risk she [CPT Linda Bray] took fighting in a city environment than the infantryman 100 yards away." The Washington Post (Moore, 1990) has also noted that

"The role of military women in Panama has become controversial in recent weeks because of political sensitivities over U.S. laws and regulations that bar women from serving in combat jobs. Many women working in support units, including the truck drivers and military police, engaged in combat during the Panama invasion."

Finally, as Moskos (1990) states, "as Panama showed, female soldiers are now assigned to positions where they can come in harm's way, even though they are technically barred from direct combat roles." Although the combat exclusion provisions attempt to protect women from the most severe exposure to the risks of war, the extent to which degrees of danger can be reliably differentiated in the context of modern warfare is questionable (Ferber, 1987). Thus, the distinction between women in combat and women in combat arms is often blurred.

Defense planners, in attempting to integrate women more effectively into the military, have developed the Direct Combat Probability Coding system (DCPC) to replace previous combat-related restrictions based on geographic characteristics of the battlefield. DCP Codes range from P1 for positions with the highest probability of direct combat (closed to women) to P7 for positions with no probability of direct combat because they are not even in a theater of operations (United States General Accounting Office, 1988; O'Brien, 1989).

According to one source (Squillace, 1986), DCPC in combination with the increase in female accessions has created a problem in at least one area--the Signal Corps. Approximately one third of the company grade officers are female and they cannot be assigned to combat-oriented assignments because of the DCPC. This creates staffing difficulties for commanders who must man units with Signal Corps officers. It also creates career

development problems for the women, who are limited in the kinds of positions in which they can serve, because of the impact on their promotion opportunities. Consequently, Squillace believes that the only feasible solution is to limit or eliminate the accessions of women into the Signal Corps.

The role of women as combatants changes from one of being trained in a noncombat specialty that includes contingency training in general combat skills, to one of being recruited, trained, evaluated, and promoted as a dedicated combat soldier. In effect the women would serve their military obligations in the enlisted, non-commissioned officer, and officer ranks of the front-line combat forces that have always been comprised of a male population. Whereas women have historically served in combat service or combat service support roles and have been exposed to the stresses and dangers of the battle as it is brought to them, now women themselves would become the actual practitioners and decision-makers of battlefield strategies. Their role would change from reacting to danger to being proactively "dangerous" themselves. The question, of course, is whether this potential role change is one that women truly want, or one that our society really expects.

The two meanings of women in combat are stated perhaps most clearly by Janowitz (1982), who points out that women in the military generally perform noncombat and combat-support tasks. Although the public thinks these women are engaged in noncombat positions, there is an important sense in which they are, in fact, in combat. In the event of military action, they are located in combat zones and are exposed to the lethal consequences of enemy action. The second meaning involves the selection and training of women to participate as combat personnel in military assault units. The critical point is that assault units both inflict casualties and are themselves subject to casualties. While the first meaning creates controversy, the second raises deeply disturbing political and social questions.

Attitude Research on Women in Combat

Attitudes of Military Personnel

According to a report by the United States General Accounting Office (1989), interviews with 82 military women (63 officers and 19 enlisted women) in all four services and various occupational specialties suggest that many of these women view the combat exclusion as a major barrier to their career advancement, because they do not have the same opportunity as men to be selected for command. Although some women said that the exclusion also affects men's perceptions of women's contributions, they expressed mixed opinions on lifting combat restrictions. Some officers stated that they would like to have the combat exclusion eliminated, but also indicated that enlisted women might feel differently.

It is possible that differences between officers' and enlisted women's attitudes toward abolishing or modifying the combat exclusion reflect differences in underlying ideology. This is suggested by the fact that one study which interviewed 48 female Army soldiers on field maneuvers found higher levels of feminism among officers than among enlisted women (Moskos, 1985). Reasons for this difference are unclear. It may be because officers have higher levels of education and feminism has typically gained more acceptance among the more highly educated, or it may be because promotions of female officers are hampered by the combat exclusion. Whatever the reasons, this would be a line of investigation which could suggest different markets to target and different strategies, especially in light of the possibility that the military is not be viewed as a nontraditional occupational choice by some women (see the later section on nontraditional occupations).

During the Falkland Islands crisis the British Navy experienced personnel problems when the Chief of Naval Operations (U.K.) decided that no female nurses would be utilized at the field hospital, and so substituted male nurses. In a final analysis, some of the male doctors felt that the smooth operation of the field hospital was compromised by not having the "teams" of doctors and nurses that had worked together before the crisis (Stewart, 1988). Other surveys indicate that male soldiers generally approve of expanding the role of women in the Army, but are hesitant to include women in combat units (Woefel, 1981).

Research from the Canadian Armed Forces suggests that opinions of male military personnel about women in combat partly depend upon the man's view of his own role as a member of the military. In a study of 1652 officers, non-commissioned officers, and enlisted men in the combat arms and support units of the Canadian army, Cotton (1979) found two disparate role identities, with different values and some tension between the types. Those with a "Soldier" role identity view their military membership as a vocation, requiring a 24-hour-a-day commitment. Those with an "Employee" orientation view the military as an occupation, with regular working hours. Cotton found that Soldiers were more than twice as likely as Employees to reject the employment of women in combat arms positions. It appears that Soldiers find this an emotional issue and feel women in combat units would have negative effects on cohesion and motivation in battle, while Employees are more likely to consider the issue in terms of the trend toward increased female participation in the labor force and concerns for equality of opportunity. As Cotton states, "the basic difference lies in their relative frames of reference; for one, it is a secular issue to do with equal opportunities for 'qualified' persons in an employment sector; for the other, it is an emotional issue linked to military traditions and survival on the battlefield" (p. 88).

We note that there are possible parallels between the Canadian study and results of the annual New Recruit Survey (NRS) conducted by USAREC at the time of accessioning. The enlistment motivations portion of the NRS asks recruits to rate the importance of a series of 25 reasons for enlisting. Recent factor-analytic and reliability studies of these questions suggest that there is a distinct factor of wanting to "Be a Soldier" given as a major reason for enlisting, as well as factors of gaining "Job Skills" and "Job Benefits" which are rated as important in the decision to enlist (Baker, 1990). If it were found that male respondents in the NRS who report "Being a Soldier" was their most important reason for enlisting were also the most opposed to the notion of women in combat roles, that would support the Canadian findings reported by Cotton (1979). Not coincidentally, Baker also reports that men are more likely than women to give "Being a Soldier" as their enlistment motivation, while women are more likely than men to enlist for reasons of "Job Skills" and equal opportunities for women in the military.

Somewhat mixed results come from a poll of war veterans and active duty men and women about their perceptions of women serving in combat roles (Kirk, 1988). The major conflict arises between the issues of women's equal rights and the propriety of women serving in combat roles. The study includes among its results the idea that the level of military personnel quality would increase if females were to constitute a larger proportion of service personnel. This increase would be measured by educational level and Armed Forces Qualifying Test (AFQT) scores. Of course, this increase would primarily reflect Army policy rather than innate male-female differences. Women must have higher educational attainments and test scores than men, on average, in order to enter the military.

Some interesting research which addresses the distinction between combat situations and combat arms can be found in a study by Campbell (1990), which surveyed WWII Army nurses during two different time periods. These Army nurses provide an important case study because during the war nearly half of the eligible civilian nurses in the entire country had joined the Army or Navy Nurse Corps. This represents the highest service rate by far of any male or female occupational group.

Campbell initially administered questionnaires to 884 Army nurses during January and February of 1945, asking about their experiences during the war. Specific issues included their reasons for volunteering and the positive and negative effects of being in the service. However, since our concern here is with current attitudes toward women in combat, Campbell's more recent research is of greater interest. During 1984 through 1986, Campbell surveyed 221 WWII veteran nurses. When asked whether women should serve in front line units, most of these nurses believed that women should not participate in front line battles, but that it was acceptable to serve in combat zone hospitals. As

Campbell puts it, "clearly, some nurses are drawing a distinction between nurses who serve in combat support units and women in the military toting guns and firing at the enemy on the front lines" (p. 265).

Campbell suggests that there were two main types of motivations that induced 350,000 women to serve in the military during WWII: general and personal motivations. Whereas patriotism is considered a general motivation, the personal motivations included factors such as: problems in family life; a chance to work outdoors, to seek adventure; having significant others in the service; having lost significant others in the service; security; impulse, friends had joined; and feminist motivations.

Public Opinion Polls

The Roper Center for Public Opinion Research at the University of Connecticut is a depository for survey results from all major polling organizations (e.g., Gallup, Harris, National Opinion Research Center, and major newspapers). As such, The Roper Center is probably the major centralized source of information regarding public attitudes toward women in combat. The Center has an existing database of approximately 135,000 questions, reaching back to about 1960, and has provided some useful indicators of opinion on this question after searching their data.

Our search of The Roper Center's database furnished descriptive data about the opinions of Americans toward women in the military from 1980 through 1990. The search was limited to this period on grounds that the most recent data would be the most useful. Some of the poll questions directly focused upon the issue of women serving in combat roles, while most dealt with related issues such as the kinds of jobs women should have in the military, women in national service, or women in the draft.

Appendix A contains the full set of questions and responses supplied by The Roper Center, grouped roughly into the categories of general opinions about women in the military, opinions about women specifically in combat, assignment of women to various military jobs (including combat), public knowledge of military job assignments for women, the conscription or draft registration of women, women in national service programs, the costs and benefits to women of being in the military, the obligations of women regarding military service, consequences of the Equal Rights Amendment, and arms control. This section focuses on those polls which specifically addressed the issues of women in combat and the assigning of women to certain kinds of jobs in the military.

Women in combat roles. Opinion polls taken by five different organizations addressed the question of whether or not women should be allowed to serve in combat roles. The actual

wording of the poll questions and response scales differed slightly, but all asked the same basic question and all used a three point scale of positive, negative, or not sure. Table 1 presents the percentages of responses in each category and the years in which the data were gathered. It is noteworthy that public approval of women serving in combat has increased over time, so that currently most Americans feel women should be permitted to function in combat roles. These polls did not distinguish between the branches of the military, so there is no way of knowing how respondents felt about women serving in combat roles specifically in the Army. Also, these polls did not offer any descriptions of the kind of risk normally associated with various combat roles. Consequently, "combat jobs" could have been interpreted in different ways by respondents.

While there were no questions that directly addressed the two issues mentioned above, Roper did provide the results of another poll which helps to offer a starting point in differentiating between the kinds of combat roles that women could face if the combat exclusion were terminated.

Women's job assignments in the military. In 1982 the National Opinion Research Center conducted personal interviews to measure the opinion of Americans about women serving in a variety of military jobs. The kinds of jobs ranged from dangerous combat-oriented positions to clerical work in the Pentagon. Table 2 shows the percentages of respondents who felt that women should be able to serve in nine different kinds of military jobs.

It is interesting to note that while serving as a combat nurse or a fighter pilot seemed to be acceptable kinds of job assignments, serving in hand-to-hand combat was not perceived to be permissible. An image that "hand-to-hand combat" could create is one of a female soldier fighting a soldier of the opposing force (possibly male) with her bare hands or with her bayonet. In the cases of the other two combat jobs, nurses are involved in a combat hospital setting and fighter pilots are above the battlefield in an aircraft. Though both jobs could be considered as being dangerous, neither of them seems to convey the mental image that hand-to-hand combat does.

With respect to the foregoing data from opinion polls, it is important to keep two points in mind (Segal, 1982). First, the circumstances which exist at the time a poll is conducted can have a major impact on the pattern of responses. If the public perceives a threat to national security, it may be more likely to favor sacrifices on the part of both men and women than it would when no threat is present. The greater and more imminent the threat, the greater the likelihood that public opinion would favor both compulsory military service and combat roles for women. Second, the questions which have so far been asked in polls (e.g., those cited above) are not the only possibilities. We might find different results if public polls asked questions

Table 1

Responses to the Question of Allowing Women to Hold Combat Jobs

Polling Organization	Year	n	Percentages		
			Positive	Negative	Unsure
ABC News/ Louis Harris ^a	1980	1198	29	68	3
Gallup ^b	1980	1548	44	52	4
NBC News/ Associated Press ^c	1981	1599	36	59	5
NBC News/ Wall Street Journal ^d	1986	1600	52	44	4
CBS News/ New York Times ^e	1990	1557	72	26	2

Note. Data were provided by The Roper Center, University of Connecticut. The wording of the question differed slightly from poll to poll. Exact questions are shown in Appendix A.

^aSee page A-12. ^bSee page A-9. ^cSee page A-10. ^dSee page A-11.

^eSee page A-6.

Table 2

Approval Ratings in 1982 of Women being Assigned
to Selected Military Jobs

Job	Percentages		
	Should	Should Not	Don't Know
Typist in the Pentagon	97	2	1
Nurse in Combat Zone	93	6	1
Truck Mechanic	82	16	1
Jet Transport Pilot	71	27	2
Jet Fighter Pilot	61	37	2
Commander of Large Military Base	57	40	3
Air Defense Missile Gunner in the United States	57	40	3
Crew Member on Combat Ship	56	41	3
Soldier in Hand-to-Hand Combat	34	64	3

Note. Data are from a national survey of 1506 adults conducted by the National Opinion Research Center, and were provided by The Roper Center, University of Connecticut. The question was worded as "Please tell me whether you think a woman should or should not be assigned to each job, assuming she is trained to do it." See pages A-14 through A-22 for details.

such as, "Would you favor allowing women to volunteer for combat roles, rather than requiring men to take these jobs?" or "Would you favor assigning young single women to combat jobs, rather than assigning young married men with children to such roles?" Responses to poll questions always depend, at least in part, on the options that are offered.

Related Attitudinal Data from Surveys

A number of surveys have been conducted to determine the motivations and attitudes of new Army recruits and civilian youth with respect to the military. Only one deals directly with the question of eliminating the combat exclusion, but it is possible to gain some idea of what the attitudes might be by looking at other related questions.

Recent Youth Attitude Tracking Surveys (YATS) have included a question asking for respondents' opinions about changing the law so that women would be allowed to volunteer for combat assignments. Only data from the Fall 1988 survey are currently available (Bray, Curtin, Theisen, & York, 1989). Results indicate little difference between the proportions of young men and young women who favor such a change (47% of the males vs. 44% of the females), or oppose it (26% of the males vs. 25% of the females). It also appears that having a positive or negative propensity to enlist in the armed forces has no effect on attitudes toward changing the law; however, positively inclined females did favor the change slightly more than positively inclined males (48% of the females vs. 43% of the males). This study also found that, unlike men, women are not more likely to enlist when unemployment rates are high. We could not, therefore, expect a downturn in employment to increase the availability of women for combat roles.

The Career Decision Survey (CDS) was conducted in 1988 with a sample of 1046 civilian youth (Wilson & Perry, 1988). Questions concerning barriers and incentives to enlistment indicate some significant differences between males and females. Money for education and the two-year tour are both more important to women than to men, women are not as concerned as men about earning less money than they could as civilians, and women are more likely than men to trust an Army recruiter. Regarding differences in the expected outcomes of making an enlistment career choice, women expect less desirable occupational/technical training, and are less concerned with having to follow many rules and regulations.

Although the CDS did not include any questions on women in combat, it did incorporate one item that is relevant here. One of the barriers to enlistment that is rated more important by women than by men is the risk of being killed. For women, this factor by itself was important enough to induce 65 percent of them to say that it would keep them from enlisting, whereas only 35 percent of the men rated it as that important. This

difference between men's and women's responses is statistically significant ($\chi^2_{(3)}=49.24$, $p<.001$).

The Army Communications Objectives Measurement Survey (ACOMS) provides some supplementary material on the issue of recruiting women, particularly with reference to their parents' views of the Army (Elig, 1989). ACOMS was a telephone survey of a sample of U.S. households, with interviews of both youth and parents. Results indicate that young women were more likely than their parents to see certain opportunities as important in making plans for the coming year. These included civilian career development, money for education, having a stepping-stone between high school and college, and developing their potential. They were also more likely to agree that the Army offers these opportunities than were their parents. These findings concerning the disparity between young women's attitudes and perceptions and those of their parents are important because the attitudes of parents tend to be even more influential in the enlistment decision than the teen's own beliefs (Maze, 1989).

The 1989 Recruit Experience Tracking Survey (RETS) was developed to measure Army soldiers' ($n=4256$) attitudes about their Army experiences (Benedict, 1990). RETS does not probe into opinions about women's roles in combat, but it does provide some insights into what might tend to motivate some women to consider re-enlistment. Survey questions that relate to re-enlistment decisions are important in that they could also affect the initial enlistment decision. Among the attitudes RETS measured were perceptions of satisfaction and dissatisfaction with the Army that might have an impact upon re-enlistment decisions.

One RETS question asked, "How likely is it that you would re-enlist if the Army would guarantee ... time off during the week to attend college?" Of the men ($n=3713$) and women ($n=440$) who responded to this question, 43.6 percent of female respondents "definitely" would re-enlist compared to only 33.6 percent of the males ($\chi^2_{(1)}=23.75$, $p<.001$). Another item was designed to test how likely respondents would be to re-enlist if cash bonuses were paid. Five different levels of bonuses, ranging from \$4,000 to \$20,000, were measured. At all levels, women were more likely than men to respond that they "definitely" would re-enlist if the Army would guarantee payment of a cash bonus. The third interesting response came from those answering a question about the realism of Army advertising in portraying life in the Army. Respondents were asked how much they agreed with the statement, "It bothers me that Army advertising does not realistically portray life in the Army." Significantly fewer females (37.8%) than males (46.9%) "strongly agreed" with this statement. It might be hypothesized that women would be more bothered than they currently are, if they were exposed to more combat role training.

If the attitudes and perceptions of soldiers surveyed at a time just prior to re-enlistment can be used to target issues that potential first-term enlistees might be concerned with, then RETS could offer USAREC some assistance with those specific issues.

Research from Analogous Settings

Women in Nontraditional Occupations

Waite and Berryman (1985) have conducted extensive analyses of data from the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth Labor Market Behavior (NLS). The NLS was a longitudinal study with annual interviews from 1979 through 1983 of a large (n=12,686) sample of U.S. youth aged 14 to 21 in the first year. The survey also included a separate sample of 1,280 persons on active duty in the military. Waite and Berryman focused on two questions: the initial choice of a nontraditional occupation and turnover. Turnover is included here because Waite and Berryman view job choice as an on-going process which incorporates re-choices as well as the initial choice. Thus, a woman who leaves a nontraditional occupation might be thought of as failing to re-choose it. A traditional occupation here is defined as one which, in the civilian sector, is composed of 75 percent or more of the same sex (i.e., an occupation with more than 75% females would be a traditionally female occupation).

Waite and Berryman found several factors related to women's choosing a nontraditional occupation. For young women, the greater the commitment to the labor force (as opposed to the home), the greater the likelihood of choosing traditionally male occupations. Also, women with higher ability were more likely to plan continuous labor force participation and therefore to choose traditionally male occupations. In addition, higher educational expectations increased the probability of a woman's choosing a traditionally male occupation.

All else being equal, being in a female-headed household at age 14 decreased the traditionality of girls' occupational choices by six percentage points and increased the chances of choosing a traditionally male occupation by eight percent. However, this effect did not hold for black girls, possibly because it has always been a more common household form among black families than among whites or Hispanics.

One of the most interesting (and potentially important) findings comes from exploratory analyses which suggest that military enlistment for women may not represent choosing a traditionally male occupation. Since women can, and seem to prefer to, enter traditionally female occupations in the military (e.g., secretary or medical technician), it could be that they select military service as a means of combining a traditionally female occupation with the rewards often available only in traditionally male occupations in the civilian sector. One would

assume that the choice to enter combat arms would be an exception, as it should definitely be viewed as a traditionally male occupation. Possibly, we need to distinguish between a male occupation (i.e., the Army) and a male job (e.g., infantry). The Air Force's experience with gender-neutral recruiting since October, 1989 suggests that women gravitate toward traditionally female specialties, and lends some support to this point.

Girls who reported that significant people in their lives (i.e., parents, friends, etc.) would approve of enlistment were more likely to expect to enlist. However, they were also more likely to expect to be in a traditionally female occupation when they reached age 35 and were no more likely to select a traditionally male occupation.

With respect to turnover, Waite and Berryman found that being in a predominantly male or female occupation had no effect on women's turnover in either the civilian or military sample. However, in mixed occupations (defined as 25-90% female in the national labor force), increases in the proportion female slightly decreased the chances of women's leaving military service within the one-year period examined. Interestingly, they also found lower turnover rates for men in predominantly female occupations in the civilian sector.

Waite and Berryman's additional findings included lower rates of turnover among black women in the military. Also, women enlistees had much lower exit rates from the military than civilians in comparable jobs. In a year's time, one out of two exited civilian jobs, while only one out of five exited the military. Presumably, this would also be true for men, given the relative difficulty of exiting the military prematurely as compared to leaving a civilian job. For the military sample, both men's and women's turnover decreased among those with formal training for the job.

Women in nontraditional jobs may feel more stress than those in traditional jobs, and women in the military may experience more stress than men, because military women do not have the same kinds of social support systems which men have (Rottman, 1985). This may partially explain why women in the Army have a higher first-term attrition rate than men, despite the fact that women in the NLS study reported higher intentions to re-enlist than men did (Martin, 1987). However, only black women in fact have higher re-enlistment rates.

Regarding the higher female attrition rate, when pregnancy is removed as a factor, the difference between male and female first-term attrition rates largely disappears (Hosek & Peterson, 1990). In a practical sense, of course, it is not possible to remove pregnancy rates. However, this does suggest that women's higher attrition is not necessarily due to stress or problems in adjusting to Army life. If a woman completes the first term of enlistment, she may be more likely to continue in the military.

After that first re-enlistment point, male and female separation rates are basically the same.

Women in the Military Forces of Other Countries

Among North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) members, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, the Netherlands, and Norway employ women in combat jobs. Israel and the United States each employ about ten percent women in the military, but both have laws or policies which exclude women from combat. While we do not have extensive information on the exact strategies used for recruiting women, Canada and Norway provide two examples of experiences with women in combat roles.

Canada. In 1987, the Canadian Forces (CF) began the Combat Related Employment of Women (CREW) study as a five-year empirical examination of mixed gender combat arms and combat support arms units in the army and navy. At the same time, it was recommended that all gender-based restrictions on employment in the air force be removed. The CREW study originated from a tasking by the Canadian Minister of National Defence to the Department of National Defence in February, 1987, "to develop trial options with the objective of determining which single gender units and military occupations could be opened to mixed gender employment without reducing the operational effectiveness." Areas to be included in the CREW effort included armour, artillery, field engineering, infantry, and signals units, and a naval warship [Director General Combat Related Employment of Women (DG CREW), 1987; Lamerson, 1989].

In 1989, the Canadian Human Rights Tribunal ruled that all combat positions (except aboard submarines) must be opened to women without limitations on their numbers. Obviously, there is little point in studying the feasibility of admitting women to combat roles, if the law requires that a service do so. Consequently, CREW was changed from an experiment to a blueprint for implementing the new policy (DG CREW, 1989b). The CREW implementation plan aims to integrate women into the military occupations from which they were previously barred, in a manner which will cause the least disruption to the individuals and units involved.

Ultimately, the CF are aiming towards a goal of gender-blind recruiting, but practical considerations preclude their immediately putting this goal into operation in all situations. One consideration, for example, is to avoid assigning only one or two women to a large all-male unit, which would put extra pressures on the women and on the unit as both learn to adapt. Consequently, the plan calls for a phased introduction of women so that problems in mixed gender units can be identified and corrected early (DG CREW, 1989c). The CF have taken the position from the beginning that even if a decision were made to open all MOSs to women without waiting for the trial results, the experience gained during CREW would benefit all combat arms

units. As BG Munro put it, "without competent female sailors and soldiers for a trial, arguments against female sailors and soldiers can only be based on expectations. Experience is a more sound basis for logic" (DG CREW, 1988a, p. 7).

The CF report that public reaction has been generally favorable to the concept of opening combat jobs to women, and to the idea of an experiment designed to collect data on actual experiences with mixed gender units (DG CREW, 1988a). Other authors, however, claim that public opinion in Canada is divided, even among feminist groups (Moore, 1989; Suh, 1989). Some opposition among feminists would not be surprising, since many are pacifist and opposed to military service for both males and females.

Currently, there are approximately 8700 women serving in the Canadian Forces. As of January 1990, 229 women were enlisted in the army or navy as officers or non-commissioned members in naval destroyer, combat arms, and combat support arms occupations. Of these, 102 had completed their basic occupation training (DG CREW, 1990a). When recruiting for combat-related positions, the CF found that there were more than adequate numbers of female volunteers for the signals and naval occupations, especially among non-commissioned members. Greater difficulty was experienced in recruiting women for infantry and artillery MOSs although the task was not infeasible (DG CREW 1988a). During the first year of CREW, 64 women enlisted for the infantry, but only about 34 went on to training. Some were released or reassigned for medical reasons, while others simply changed their minds about their willingness to undergo infantry training and requested release or reassignment (DG CREW, 1988b). Some women did transfer into the combat specialties, but most have held back, just as men who enlist for other MOSs rarely seek transfer into the combat arms (DG CREW, 1988a).

Only in infantry training have the CF found a significant failure rate among female candidates. Of the 40 who have attempted it, only one woman so far has been able to complete the 16-week infantry training course (four are currently still undergoing training). Women in the other combat MOSs, in contrast to infantry, seem to have training completion and attrition rates comparable to those which would be expected among male CF members (DG CREW, 1988b, 1989a, 1990b).

The failures in infantry training are believed to be due to unsatisfactory recruiting and screening, as well as stamina limitations of the female trainees. The Canadian Forces Training System attributes failures partly to the use of separate fitness standards in basic training, where men and women are trained to different physical standards. Since completing basic training is the prerequisite for entering infantry training, men and women come into the more rigorous infantry training course with different initial capabilities.

Without additional information on the similarities and differences between infantry training in the U.S. and Canada, we cannot draw firm conclusions regarding the feasibility of recruiting women for those MOSs. The Canadian experience does lead us to believe, however, that a great deal of care would be needed in recruiting women for the infantry, if that situation ever arose. Interviews with women who failed to complete the CF infantry training course, but who came closest to succeeding, suggest that the women being recruited as candidates for the infantry needed to receive a more accurate picture of the training involved. Almost all of these women commented that the film they were shown during recruitment was not a realistic portrayal of infantry training and suggested that it be revised to show actual training exercises and conditions. It appears that the initial pressures to provide sufficient volunteers for the CREW trials could have led to recruiting ill-informed and unprepared candidates for the infantry (DG CREW, 1990c). In other combat MOSs, recruiting women could be somewhat less problematic.

The numbers of women involved are not large enough to draw general conclusions, but Canada's experience with recruiting may be informative if USAREC should need to recruit women for the combat arms. It is especially interesting when contrasted with the case of Norway, which has been very successful in recruiting women for combat positions.

Norway. Norway opened combat jobs to women in 1984 and is today the only country which permits women crew members on submarines. Although the overall percentage of women in the Norwegian military forces is still very small (about two percent), recruiting efforts seem to be quite successful due to an aggressive advertising campaign which targets women. Sixteen percent of all voluntary recruits are women, giving Norway one of the highest female recruitment rates in the world (Moore, 1989). Therefore, the simple fact of allowing women to enter combat positions does not seem to be an obstacle to effective recruiting, provided that it is coupled with appropriate marketing strategies. We do not, however, have any information on women's success rates in combat positions.

Women in Other Branches of the U.S. Military

The Coast Guard differs from the other services in that its women are unrestricted by the law which prohibits women in combat positions. They can be assigned to any kind of duty on any kind of Coast Guard vessel, some of which are expected to have combat missions in wartime. In time of war, jurisdiction over the Coast Guard is transferred from the Department of Transportation to the Secretary of the Navy. However, according to a Navy Judge Advocate General opinion, the statutory restrictions on Navy women would not apply to Coast Guard women, although the Secretary of the Navy has authority to decide whether or not to apply similar restrictions (Ferber, 1987). Coast Guard policy is

that removal of women crew members from ships which might be assigned combat missions when operating with the Navy would be detrimental to ship operations (Ferber, 1987; Rottman, 1985). Although we have few details on Coast Guard recruiting, this is a potential source of information which could be useful in addressing the issue of recruiting women for combat positions.

Issues Facing Recruiters

As noted in the introduction, there are a number of pro and con arguments appearing in the media with regard to the issue of women in combat. The most prevalent are listed below. Our purpose here is not to debate the question of whether or not women should be allowed in combat, but rather to point out that these are the arguments which USAREC and/or the individual recruiter would need to deal with and counter in attempting to effectively recruit women for combat arms. This is the debate being heard by both the young women who are potential recruits and those who influence those young women's decisions--their parents, relatives, and friends--as well as by the general public. Understanding the specific arguments against women serving in combat would aid USAREC planners in developing new programs to ensure female accessions should it become necessary to recruit women for combat roles.

The Argument against Women in Combat

Negative views of women serving in combat roles originate in both the public and private sectors. Those opposed to the idea of permitting women to assume combat roles (e.g., Mitchell, 1989; Reed, 1990) often cite the following reasons:

1. Women are not as strong. Females have physical limitations which restrict their performance. They also tend to have higher injury rates.
2. Standards are not equal. Physical standards have been modified to reflect the physiological differences between female and male soldiers, which in effect lowers the standards for the females.
3. Women are not fighters. Women may not possess the "savagery" that would be required in the battlefield.
4. Women cannot handle combat stress. Little data exists that demonstrates how men and women would interrelate under the strain of combat.
5. We should protect the fairer sex. Women should not be exposed to the unpleasantness of war. Being taken prisoner could result in one's torture, rape, or death.
6. Women are poor investments. Women have a higher rate of first-term turnover than men. This translates into lower

retention rates and higher attrition rates than men. Women performing in male-oriented jobs tend to migrate, over time, back into those jobs usually perceived as being female.

7. Women are absent more. Women take off more time than men. It is suggested that this is due in part to "spurious physical ailments," though fewer females take time off as a result of substance abuse or disciplinary reasons.

8. Women cause staffing problems. Problems arise in management of duty station assignment with dual-servicemember families. Other issues relating to single-parentage and pregnancies have been cited as being problematic.

9. Women cause morality problems. Women are "three times more likely to be discharged for homosexuality" (Mitchell, 1989, p. 5).

10. Women do not have what it takes. "Military women are less aggressive, less daring, less likely to suppress minor personal hurts, less aware of world affairs, less interested in military history, less respectful of military tradition, and less inclined to make the military a career" (Mitchell, 1989, p. 7).

11. Women have lower test scores. Women score lower than men on entrance tests oriented toward subjects involving military jobs.

12. Women cause disruption that affects stability. Military power is a function of the perception of our military capability along with the propensity to use that capability. Military readiness could be adversely affected by conflicting values. This would manifest itself in problems with unit cohesion. This conflict could affect recruiting efforts and social acceptance of draft registration requirements (Cecil, 1988).

13. There would be a drop in accessions. "To tell women recruits they would be subjected to the same combat liabilities as men would surely cause a drop among women joining the military" (Moskos, 1990).

The above points are some of the arguments with which Army recruiters would have to contend if they needed to recruit women for combat positions. Certainly, the above list is not exhaustive; these are merely the more common themes. In contrast, some of the more favorable arguments are presented below.

Countering the Negative Views

The list of arguments against women in combat represents a spectrum of perceptions and facts ranging from physiological to psychological to moral. Holm (1982) claims that commonly held

"myths" about the nature of combat must be replaced with facts before women will be considered suitable for combat roles. Many of the arguments against women in combat are reflected in her discussion of the following four points, which Holm claims represent inaccurate beliefs.

1. The law prohibits women from combat. According to Holm, the first myth concerns laws that prohibit women from serving in combat roles. There is no "all-inclusive" combat exclusion law, although there are laws that prohibit women from serving aboard naval combat vessels or in combat situations aboard Navy or Air Force aircraft, as well as an Army policy of excluding women from positions with the highest risk of direct combat involvement.

2. Combat duty is dangerous, noncombat duty is safe. The second myth involves the nature of combat and how it can be defined in modern terms. Holm states that it is no longer possible "to make clear distinctions between what does and what does not constitute combat duty, and what is or is not a combat mission" (p. 395). The myth that soldiers in combat roles face more danger than those in rear areas (or even those far removed from the theatre of operations) must be dispelled because new advances in military technology, and the increased likelihood of low-intensity conflict (vs. conventional warfare), have made all areas of duty equally dangerous. In low-intensity conflict there is no "front" in the conventional sense, or rather the front is everywhere and all soldiers are equally at risk. Holm suggests that the distinctions between the missions of those in combat roles and those in noncombat roles are artificial and misleading.

3. Excluding women from combat will protect them. The third myth that Holm claims must be dispelled is the one that suggests that it is "possible to protect women from the risks and horrors of combat in the event of even a limited war" (p. 395). Holm claims that the record shows a history full of examples of how American women have been exposed to the horrors of war and suggests that leaders should be more concerned with addressing the safety needs of the civilian population in the extreme example of a nuclear confrontation, rather than worrying about the welfare and safety of female soldiers.

4. Combat soldiers must be especially strong. The last myth that Holm wishes to abolish is the false notion that all forms of combat activity require more physical strength and stamina than most women possess. As our technology advances, the requirement for "sheer brawn" is replaced with the need for highly educated and intelligent people. This myth must be eliminated because the changing nature of our defense arsenal, and the trend toward smaller, more dispersed units, intensifies the need to recruit more intelligent soldiers, soldiers with problem-solving capabilities.

In addition to Holm's case for reexamining the nature of modern warfare, other positive views of women in the Army and in combat have been presented by several authors. These include:

5. Women are equal to men in competence. Women in the military are performing their duty requirements to the same level of professional competence as their male counterparts (Office of the Secretary of Defense, 1988).

6. There is no proof that women cannot do the job. According to McNally (1985), ". . . a thorough review of the tests and experiments which have been conducted concerning women in the military and an analysis of the traditional arguments against women serving in combat conclude that there exists no persuasive evidence to suggest that women will not perform effectively when allowed to serve in combat roles."

7. There is proof that women can do the job. The U.S. Army Research Institute has conducted two very large studies, MAXWAC and REFWAC, which were designed to observe women in various combat situations. (MAXWAC refers to a study of the maximum proportion of women which could be permitted in various units without degrading the unit's performance. REFWAC refers to a study of women in the REFORGER exercises in Europe.) Both studies produced similar results. Most of the women performed adequately under simulated combat conditions (No "special stresses," 1980).

These, then, are some of the pro and con arguments which recruiters might face if combat exclusions policies were modified and it became necessary to recruit women for combat roles. Also, the general problems of military personnel which are traditionally seen as women's issues (e.g., child-care provisions, assignments for dual-career marriages, sexual harassment), while not specific to the issue of women in combat, are increasingly being discussed in the popular media (e.g., see The Washington Post series on "Women in the Military," September 24-26, 1989) and could exaggerate problems of recruiting females if women were admitted to combat arms. In addition, recruiters would be faced with the changing demographic characteristics of the U.S. population.

The Feminization of the Workforce

The demographic changes affecting the availability of males for the pool of military manpower might create more reliance on women to help fill the vacant slots. Some of these would be in nontraditional soldiering roles. Until now, the actual growth of female manning levels has been in traditional areas such as administration, communications, and medical (Seeney, Divalentin, & Halbrook, 1987). Over the next 15 years, the participation of women in the U.S. workforce is expected to continue to increase. By 2000, approximately 47% of the workforce will be female, and 61% of all females will be in the workforce. Another way to look

at this is that three fifths of new labor force entrants over the next 15 years will be female (Johnston, 1987; Kutscher, 1989).

The implications of this demographic shift for the Army are that the available pool of new recruits will become increasingly more female and policy changes might be necessary to enable these female soldiers to function in critical and heretofore strictly male job areas, such as the combat arms. Of course, it is also possible that force reductions would tend to minimize any effects of the changing workforce. As the U.S. Army draws fewer and fewer enlistees from the population, it becomes less and less vulnerable to demographic shifts of this nature. Although beyond the scope of this report, this issue raises an important question: Would force reductions result in a return to a policy of "last hired, first fired" for women?

Recruiting Focus

In terms of recruiting new females into the ranks of the three combat arms branches, it would seem incumbent upon USAFEC to address any negative perceptions before volunteers can be expected to seriously consider these branches as viable career options. Addressing these issues could involve several strategies:

1. Offer some forms of incentives to join in spite of any "bad press" or negative opinions. The same reasons that men use for not wanting to join the combat arms over the branches of their choice may be the same reasons that females would use for not wanting to join the combat arms. Once the combat arms were opened up to females, they might have to rationalize their decision to enter these branches (being fully aware of the challenges and dangers) by the process of cognitive dissonance. Incentives such as the Army College Fund (ACF), bonuses, and fast-track promotions in grade could be used to facilitate recruiting women. In addition, there may be some variability in perceptions of serving in the combat arms between women entering the enlisted ranks versus those entering the officer corps. If this were the case, then it would be necessary to develop different marketing efforts for the two groups.

2. Focus marketing efforts upon counteracting, dispelling, or acknowledging the negative aspects. The overall goal would be to minimize the most severe of the negative aspects, such as being raped or killed, while presenting a realistic portrayal of the lesser negatives such as the work being more physically demanding.

3. Simultaneously, much more emphasis could be placed upon the positive features or attributes of joining the combat arms. More research needs to be done into the questions of how the relative strengths of motivators, satisfiers, and dissatisfiers would yield behavioral predictability of women joining the combat arms. One possibility (not specific to combat arms) would be to

develop a higher degree of visibility for those Army women currently in command positions. Young women would thus have role models and the parents of those young women would be made more aware of the career potential in the Army.

Research Directions

In view of the foregoing discussion and examination of some of the available research, a number of different questions are suggested. These include:

1. Would women want to join the combat arms branches at all?
2. Would women want to join the Army at all since they would now be faced with assignment to combat duties? They knew that there was danger before, but they also knew that it was limited. Now they could be in direct combat situations where the danger is most certainly known to exist.
3. Would women be more likely to join the combat arms branches because of the increased incentives?
4. Would women still enlist, but request no-risk (e.g., DCPC P7) assignments because they are safer?
5. Would men be more likely to enlist in combat arms positions because they would be perceived as less risky than previously thought? Men might reason that the positions cannot be that dangerous if women are allowed to enter them. Or some might prefer a mixed to a single-sex environment.
6. What would be the key adverse perceptions that recruiting would have to overcome in order to make mission?

Answering these questions would probably require several different approaches. Survey research which explicitly solicits answers from current and potential recruits is one possibility. Studying changes in national opinion on the topic of women in combat is another possible avenue of inquiry. Examining the recruiting problems and strategies of civilian organizations which bear some similarity to the military is a third possibility which could be helpful.

Future Survey Research

In addition to previously conducted surveys described in the earlier section on attitudinal data, the 1990 Survey of High School Youth and Parents is currently being administered. This project will survey 10,000 high school juniors and seniors, with a separate sample of 300 parents. Since the student survey is being conducted in-class, it should yield a high response rate. Included in this survey are two questions addressing the issue of women in combat (see Appendix B). The first asks whether respondents favor or oppose changing the law so that women would

be allowed to volunteer for combat assignments. The second asks how likely respondents would be to serve in the Army if women were permitted to volunteer for combat assignments. The purpose is to assess opinions on a change in policy and any likely change in enlistment intentions if women are admitted to combat positions. Final results are not yet available, but data from these questions should give us additional information on the attitudes of U.S. youth toward women in combat.

We can also incorporate items dealing with the issue of women in combat into an addendum to the USAREC New Recruit Survey. The New Recruit Survey is an on-going survey of Army soldiers at the time of entry onto active duty. During the summer of 1990 a supplementary questionnaire (see Appendix C) will be administered along with the NRS. This questionnaire asks about both the respondents' opinions on the question of permitting women in combat and the possible impact on their enlistment intentions which such a change would have. Data from this survey should give us a much better picture of the consequences for recruiting if the combat MOSSs are opened to women.

Studying Civilian Organizations with Parallels to the Military

We have reviewed some of the activities that the military establishments in the United States and other countries have undertaken to study women in combat. Another approach is to focus upon analogous organizations such as large police and fire departments. The similarities between these and Army combat organizations could be analyzed for recruiting purposes. Specific issues to study could include:

1. Elements of danger in the line of duty.
2. Interpersonal relations between genders.
3. Performance of duties under emotional and physical stress.
4. Retention rates.
5. Recruiting costs and methodologies.
6. Equal opportunity for career advancement for both males and females.

For example, in one study of 71 male Los Angeles police officers, the officer's rank, rank of partner, time on the job, and quality of contact were all predictive of the men's attitudes. The officers participated in pre- and post-testing to measure attitudes toward working with female police partners. Hypotheses which proposed a positive change in males' attitudes about working with women as a result of favorable perceptions of females' competence were not supported (Glaser, 1983). Perhaps conducting studies of large police and fire departments' recruiting programs would yield useful data to benefit the planning at USAREC.

Summary and Conclusions

A number of different areas have been reviewed here, ranging from historical precedents for women in combat to current attitudes toward eliminating combat restrictions to future challenges facing recruiters. Our intention throughout has been to provide a broad picture of the issue and its implications for recruiting young women (and, to a lesser extent, young men) into the U.S. Army.

Attitudes and opinions on the topic of women in combat are quite mixed, with no real consensus emerging. This is often true when a social change of this magnitude is under consideration. We might argue, however, that this change is not merely under consideration, but already occurring due to the changing nature of warfare (as evidenced by the case of CPT Bray in Panama). In this particular case, the mixture of attitudes may also reflect that fact that individuals, when queried about their opinions, are focusing on different aspects of the question. For one person, the potential dangers facing women in combat arms may be the most important issue. For another, the question of women's competence in combat may be the overriding concern. We have noted the distinction between women in combat and women in combat arms, as well as the distinction between volunteering for combat and being involuntarily assigned.

Even though women have never been actively recruited for combat arms positions in the U.S., other NATO countries have recruited and utilized women in combat jobs with varying degrees of success. Although the numbers of women are still relatively small, there are potentially useful examples in the experiences of Canada and Norway.

Some of the relevant findings from past surveys and national polls were presented and discussed, as well as suggestions for future research questions and directions. Little material which bears directly on the issue is currently available, but additional information about the attitudes and motivations of new recruits and high school youth should be forthcoming shortly. Specific items have been incorporated into new and existing questionnaires in order to obtain more applicable data.

Finally, we noted some of the issues and arguments which recruiters might face in attempting to recruit women for combat positions, and made a few suggestions regarding the focus of recruiting efforts. We believe that eliminating or modifying the combat exclusion for women would have direct ramifications for USAREC's policies and practices at two levels--national marketing approaches and individual recruiter tactics. Recruiting strategies would need to be developed or modified to assure female accessions. If so, new or revised strategies for recruiters would also need to be reflected in recruiter training programs.

REFERENCES

- Baker, T. A. (1990). Scale development for enlistment motivation measures (Technical Report). Alexandria, VA: U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences. (Pre-publication copy)
- Benedict, M. E. (1990). The 1989 Recruit Experience Tracking Survey: User's manual/codebook (ARI RR 1548). Alexandria, VA: U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences. (AD A220 024)
- Bray, R. M., Curtin, T. R., Theisen, A. C., & York, B. J. (1989). Patterns and trends in propensity to enlist in the military: Findings from the 1988 Youth Attitude Tracking Study II (Contract MDA903-86-C-0066). Arlington, VA: Defense Manpower Data Center. (Draft)
- Binkin, M. & Eitelberg, M. (1986). Women and minorities in the all-volunteer force. In E. Bowmen, R. Little, & G. T. Sicilia (Eds.), The all-volunteer force after a decade (pp. 73-102). Washington, DC: Pergamon-Brassey's.
- Brewer, C. L. (1987). The role of women in police work: An historical and empirical analysis of prevailing attitudes. Long Beach: California State University.
- Campbell, D. (1990). Servicewomen of World War II. Armed Forces and Society, 16, 265.
- Cecil, T. H. (1988). Women in combat: Pros and cons (Report No. ACSC-88-0490). Maxwell Air Force Base, AL: Air Command and Staff College.
- Cotton, C. A. (1979). Military attitudes and values of the army in Canada (Research Report 79-5). Willowdale, Ontario: Canadian Forces Personnel Applied Research Unit.
- Director General Combat Related Employment of Women. (1987, May). Combat related employment (of) women (CREW) trial recommendations, Part I: Introduction [5324-1 (DG CREW) 27 May 1987]. Ottawa, Ontario: National Defence Headquarters.
- Director General Combat Related Employment of Women. (1988, September). Combat related employment of women trials: Report of training production and pre-trial employment [5324-5 (DG CREW) 19 September 1988]. Ottawa, Ontario: National Defence Headquarters. (a)
- Director General Combat Related Employment of Women. (1988, November). CREW trial SITREP [5324-5 (DG CREW) 16 November 1988]. Ottawa, Ontario: National Defence Headquarters. (b)

- Director General Combat Related Employment of Women. (1989, February). CREW trial SITREP [5324-5 (DG CREW) 17 February 1989]. Ottawa, Ontario: National Defence Headquarters. (a)
- Director General Combat Related Employment of Women. (1989, September). CREW SITREP [5324-5 (DG CREW) 01 September 1989]. Ottawa, Ontario: National Defence Headquarters. (b)
- Director General Combat Related Employment of Women. (1989, September). CREW SITREP [5324-5 (DG CREW) 26 September 1989]. Ottawa, Ontario: National Defence Headquarters. (c)
- Director General Combat Related Employment of Women. (1990, January). CREW SITREP [5324-5 (DG CREW) 19 January 1990]. Ottawa, Ontario: National Defence Headquarters. (a)
- Director General Combat Related Employment of Women. (1990, February). Female infantryman 031 selection and physical training standards [4816-2-5 (DPERA 2-2) 19 February 1990]. Ottawa, Ontario: National Defence Headquarters. (b)
- Director General Combat Related Employment of Women. (1990, March). Recruiting and training women in the infantry [5324-1 (D CREW) 1 March 1990]. Ottawa, Ontario: National Defence Headquarters. (c)
- Dusky, L. (1990, May). McCall's poll: Combat ban stops women's progress, not bullets. McCall's, pp. 26, 28.
- Elig, T. W. (1989, October). Views of U.S. youth on military service and college enrollment as alternatives to full-time employment. Paper presented at the 1989 Biennial Conference of the Inter-University Seminar on Armed Forces and Society, Baltimore, MD.
- Ferber, M. M. (1987, November 19). Testimony: Combat exclusion laws for women in the military (Statement of Martin M. Ferber, Senior Associate Director, National Security and International Affairs Division, before the Subcommittee on Military Personnel and Compensation, House Armed Services Committee, United States House of Representatives) (Report GAO/T-NSIAD-88-8). Washington, DC: United States General Accounting Office.
- Future female soldier asks if woman's place is in battle. (1990, March 5). [Letter to Abigail Van Buren]. Asheville Citizen.
- Glaser, D. F. (1983). Male police officers attitudes toward working with female police officers. Los Angeles: California School of Professional Psychology.
- Goldman, N. L. (Ed.). (1982). Female soldiers--combatants or noncombatants? Historical and contemporary perspectives. Westport, CN: Greenwood Press.

- Goldman, N. L., & Wiegand, K. L. (1982). The utilization of women in combat: An historical and social analysis of twentieth-century wartime and peacetime experience (Report No. PR77198-JDSS-W-A). Baltimore, MD: Towson State University.
- Heilman, M. E., Block, C. J., Martelli, R. F., & Simon, M. C. (1989). Has anything changed? Current characterizations of men, women, and managers. Journal of Applied Psychology, 74, 935-942.
- Holm, J. (1982). Women in the military. Novato, CA: Presidio Press.
- Hosek, J. R., & Peterson, C. F. (1990). Serving her country: An analysis of women's enlistment (Research Report R-3853-FMP). Santa Monica, CA: The RAND Corporation.
- Janowitz, M. (1982). Foreword. In N. L. Goldman (Ed.), Female soldiers--combatants or noncombatants? Historical and contemporary perspectives (pp. xi-xiii). Westport, CN: Greenwood Press.
- Johnston, W. B. (Project Director). (1987). Workforce 2000: Work and workers for the twenty-first century. Indianapolis, IN: Hudson Institute.
- Kester, J. G. (1986). The reasons for the draft. In W. Bowman, R. Little, & G. T. Sicilia (Eds.), The all-volunteer force after a decade (pp. 286-315). Washington, DC: Pergamon-Brassey's.
- Kirk, K. F. (1988). Women in combat? Monterey, CA: Naval Postgraduate School.
- Kutscher, R. E. (1989). Projections summary and emerging issues. Monthly Labor Review, 112(11), 66-74.
- Lamerson, C. D. (1989, July). Combat related employment of women (CREW) in the army: Trial research plan (Working Paper 89-2). Willowdale, Ontario: Canadian Forces Personnel Applied Research Unit.
- Letter battle breaks out over women in combat. (1990, April 16). [Letters to Abigail Van Buren]. Asheville Citizen.
- Martin, H. P. (1987). The integration of women into the military: A preliminary investigation of relevant factors. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Texas at Austin. (University Microfilms No. 87-17,476)
- Maze, R. (1989, November 20). Study: Teens more positive than parents on military. Air Force Times, p. 25.

- Maze, R. (1990, February 5). Women need to learn infantry skills, Warner says. Army Times, p. 10.
- McNally, J. A. (1985). Women in the United States military: A contemporary perspective (Report No. NWC-W84-82) Newport, RI: Naval War College.
- Mitchell, B. (1999). Weak link: The feminization of the American military. Washington, DC: Regnery Gateway.
- Moore, M. (1989, September 26). Canada's leap to equality in combat. The Washington Post, pp. A1, A18-A19.
- Moore, M. (1990, January 22). Army: Female drivers did not disobey orders. The Washington Post, p. A17.
- Moskos, C. C. (1985). Female GIs in the field. Society, 22, 28-33.
- Moskos, C. C. (1986). The marketplace all-volunteer force: a critique. In W. Bowman, R. Little, & G. T. Sicilia (Eds.), The all-volunteer force after a decade (pp. 15-17). Washington, DC: Pergamon-Brassey's.
- Moskos, C. C. (1990, February 4). Women in combat: The same risks as men? The Washington Post, p. C7.
- No "special stresses" for women in battle. (1980, March 3). [Interview with Nora Scott Kinzer, military personnel expert]. U.S. News and World Report, p. 34.
- O'Brien, T. (1989). New jobs open to women. Soldiers, 44(2), 10-11.
- Office of the Secretary of Defense. (1988). Military women in the Department of Defense, 6.
- Oliver, L. (1982). Effect of intergroup contact on attitudes toward the role of women in the Army (Research Report 1330). Alexandria, VA: U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences. (AD A138 993)
- Quinn, K. E., & Toulson, P. K. (1988). Military manpower trends: Women in combat (TTCP-UTP3). The Technical Cooperation Program.
- Reed, F. (1990, January 29). Women in combat: A real bad idea. Army Times, p. 62.
- Rottman, M. (1985). Women graduates of the U.S. Coast Guard Academy: Views from the bridge. Armed Forces and Society, 11, 249-270.

- Seeney, R. W., Jr., Divalentin, A., III, & Halbrook, E. (1987). Women in the army: The right numbers - the wrong skills. Carlisle Barracks, PA: The Army War College.
- Segal, M. W. (1982). The argument for female combatants. In N. L. Goldman (Ed.), Female soldiers--combatants or noncombatants? Historical and contemporary perspectives (pp. 267-290). Westport, CN: Greenwood Press.
- Squillace, R. C. (1986). Direct combat probability coding and its effect on officer leadership in the signal corps. Carlisle Barracks, PA: The Army War College.
- Stewart, N. K. (1988). South atlantic conflict of 1982: A case study in military cohesion (Research Report 1469). Alexandria, VA: U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences. (AD A193 790)
- Suh, M. (1989, June). Canadian women at arms: Combat duty is no longer a male preserve. Ms. Magazine, pp. 71-72.
- United States General Accounting Office. (1988, July). Women in the military: Impact of proposed legislation to open more combat support positions and units to women (Briefing Report to Congressional Requesters) (Research Report GAO/NSIAD-88-197BR). Gaithersburg, MD: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- United States General Accounting Office. (1989, September). Women in the military: Career progression not a current problem but concerns remain (Briefing Report to the Chairman, Subcommittee on Military Personnel and Compensation, Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives) (Research Report GAO/NSLAD-89-210BR). Gaithersburg, MD: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Waite, L. J., & Berryman, S. E. (1985). Women in nontraditional occupations: Choice and turnover (Research Report). Santa Monica, CA: The RAND Corporation.
- Wilson, M. J., & Perry, M. S. (1988). The career decision survey technical manual (ARI RP 88-23). Alexandria, VA: U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences. (AD A206 927)
- Woefel, J. C. (1981). Women in the United States Army. Sex Roles, 7, 785-800.

APPENDIX A

ROPER CENTER PUBLIC OPINION DATA SEARCH

Topic: WOMEN IN THE ARMED FORCES (1980-present)

Date: February 7, 1990

The following is the public opinion data search conducted for you. Please call the Center should you have any questions or comments regarding these data. 203-486-4440

Source attribution should include the survey organization, research sponsors (if applicable), and a notation that the data was provided by the Roper Center, University of Connecticut.

Question:

R280 In the past 10 years the number of women in the armed forces has increased from about 2 percent to about 8 percent today. In general, would you say the increased number of women has raised the effectiveness of our armed forces, has it made no difference, or has it made our armed forces less effective?

Responses:

Raised effectiveness	28%
No difference	41
Made them less effective	8
Don't know	11

Survey Organization:	National Opinion Research Center	
Population:	National adult	
Population Size:	1986	
Interview method:	Personal	
Beginning date:	FEB 1982	Ending date: APR 1982
Source Document:	General Social Survey 1982 Supplement	
Study Note:	Part Of A Continuing Series Of Social Indicators	
Conducted Since 1972:		
Date of Source Document:	JUL 1983	
Subject:	WOMEN	
	DEFENSE	

FULL QUESTION ID USNORC 655625 R280

Question:

R275C (As you know, this country stopped the military draft in 1972. Since that time we have relied on volunteers. Now I'd like to ask you a few questions about our armed forces)... At the present time, about 9 percent of the armed forces are women. All things considered, do you think there are too many women in the armed forces, about the right number, or should there be more women in the armed forces?

Responses:

Too many	8%
About right number	54
Should be more	38
• Don't know	8

Survey Organization:	National Opinion Research Center
Population:	National Adult
Population Size:	1599
Interview method:	Personal Interview
Beginning date:	FEB 1983
Source Document:	General Social Survey 1983
Study Note:	Part Of A Continuing Series Of Social Indicators
Conducted Since 1972:	
Date of Source Document	JUL 1983
Subject:	DEFENSE
	WOMEN

FULL QUESTION ID USNDPC 65563 R275C

.....

Question:

R2B9C (As you know, this country stopped the military draft in 1972. Since that time we have relied on volunteers. Now I'd like to ask you a few questions about our armed forces.)... At the present time, about 7 percent of the armed forces are women. All things considered, do you think there are too many women in the armed forces, about the right number, or should there be more women in the armed forces?

Responses:

Too many	7%
About right number	54
Should be more	32
Don't know	6

Survey Organization:	National Opinion Research Center
Population:	National adult
Population Size:	1473
Interview method:	Personal
Beginning date:	FEB 1984
Source Document:	General Social Survey 1984 Supplement
Study Note:	Part Of A Continuing Series Of Social Indicators
Conducted Since	1972
Date of Source Document:	JUL 1985
Subject:	DEFENSE
	WOMEN

FULL QUESTION ID USNOPC G55B45 R2B9C

Question.

R2B9C (As you know, this country stopped the military draft in 1972. Since that time we have relied on volunteers. Now I'd like to ask you a few questions about our armed forces.)... At the present time, about 9 percent of the armed forces are women. All things considered, do you think there are too many women in the armed forces, about the right number, or should there be more women in the armed forces?

Responses:

Too many	8%
About right number	83
Should be more	31
Don't know	8

Survey Organization:	National Opinion Research Center
Population:	National adult
Population Size:	1506
Interview method:	Personal
Beginning date:	FEB 1982
Source Document:	General Social Survey 1982 Supplement
Study Note:	Part Of A Continuing Series Of Social Indicators
Conducted Since 1972	
Date of Source Document:	JUL 1983
Subject:	DEFENSE
	WOMEN

FULL QUESTION ID USNDPC G55925 R2B9C

Question:

R53 About 11 percent of the armed forces are women. Right now, they can serve in support positions, but not in combat units. Do you think women members of the armed forces should be allowed to serve in combat units if they want to, or don't you think so?

Responses:

Should	72%
Should not	26
Don't know/No answer	2

Survey Organization:	CBS News/New York Times
Population:	National adult
Population Size:	1557
Interview method:	Telephone
Beginning date:	JAN 13, 1998
Ending date:	JAN 15, 1998
Source Document:	CBS News/New York Times
Date of Source Document:	JAN 1998
Subject:	WOMEN DEFENSE

FULL QUESTION ID USCBSNYT.98JAN1.R53

.....

Question.

R3 If women are drafted, should they be required to take combat roles as men are, should they be given combat roles only if they volunteer for them, or should they not be eligible for them?

Responses:

Given combat roles as men	18%
Only if volunteer	68
Not eligible	71
Don't know	1

Survey Organization:	Gallup Organization
Research Sponsor:	Newsweek
Population:	Young people aged 18 to 24
Population Size:	860
Interview method:	Telephone
Beginning date:	JAN 31, 1980
Source Document:	Gallup/Newsweek
Date of Source Document:	FEB 18, 1980
Subject:	DEFENSE
	YOUTH
	WOMEN

FULL QUESTION ID USGALNEW 021280 R3

Question.

Q09F (If a draft were to become necessary), should women be eligible for combat roles, or not?

Subpopulation. See note

Responses:

Yes	41%
No	54
No Opinion	5

Asked of those who thought that if a draft were to become necessary, young women as well as young men should be required to participate (51%).

Survey Organization:	Gallup Organization	
Population:	National adult	
Population Size:	1584	
Interview method:	Personal	
Beginning date:	FEB 1, 1980	Ending date: FEB 4, 1980
Source Document:	Gallup Poll-Aipo	
Date of Source Document:	FEB 4, 1980	
Subject:	DEFENSE	
	WOMEN	

FULL QUESTION ID USGALLUP 114B Q09F

.....
Question:
0007C Should women be eligible for combat roles, or not?

Subpopulation: Think women should be drafted (49%)

Responses.

Yes	44%
No	52
No Opinion	4

Survey Organization:	Gallup Organization	
Population:	National adult	
Population Size:	1548	
Interview method:	Personal	
Beginning date:	JUL 11, 1980	Ending date: JUL 14, 1980
Source Document:	Gallup Poll-Aigo	
Date of Source Document:	JUL 14, 1980	
Subject:	DEFENSE	
	WOMEN	

FULL QUESTION ID. USGALLUP.1159.0007C

Question

R37 Under current law, women are not allowed to hold combat jobs in the armed forces. Do you think women should or should not be allowed to hold combat jobs in the armed forces?

Responses:

Should	36%
Should not	59
Not sure	5

Survey Organization:	NBC News/Associated Press
Population:	National adult
Population Size:	1599
Interview method:	Telephone
Beginning date:	JUL 13, 1981
Source Document:	NBC News/Associated Press
Date of Source Document:	JUL 24, 1981
Subject:	DEFENSE WOMEN

FULL QUESTION ID. USNBCAP 6B R37

Question:

R1 Under current law, women are not allowed to hold combat jobs in the U S armed forces. Do you think women should or should not be allowed to hold combat jobs in the armed forces?

Responses:

Yes, should hold combat jobs	52%
No, should not hold combat jobs	44
Not sure	4

Survey Organization:	NBC News/Wall Street Journal		
Population:	National adult		
Population Size:	1600		
Interview method:	Telephone		
Beginning date:	JUL 14, 1986	Ending date:	JUL 13, 1986
Source Document:	NBC News/Wall Street Journal		
Date of Source Document:	JAN 16, 1987		
Subject:	DEFENSE		
	WOMEN		

FULL QUESTION ID. USNBCWSJ.211687.R1

Question.

R24 Do you favor or oppose women in the military being assigned to combat units?

Responses:

Favor	29%
Oppose	68
Not sure	3

Survey Organization:	ABC News/Louis Harris And Associates
Population:	Likely voters
Population Size:	1198
Interview method:	Telephone
Beginning date:	JAN 31, 1988
Source Document:	ABC News/Harris Survey
Date of Source Document:	MAR 7, 1988
Subject:	DEFENSE
	WOMEN

FULL QUESTION ID: USABCHS 030788 R04

Question:

R527 (I'm going to read to you a list of statements relating to current issues. For each one I'd like you to tell me whether you agree strongly, agree somewhat, neither agree nor disagree, disagree somewhat, or disagree strongly)... There should be a draft of women for combat duty

Responses:

Agree strongly	92
Agree somewhat	37
Neither agree nor disagree	7
Disagree somewhat	28
Disagree strongly	47

Survey Organization:	Research And Forecasts
Research Sponsor:	Connecticut Mutual Life Insurance
Population:	See note
Population Size:	2018
Interview method:	Telephone
Beginning date:	SEP 1, 1980
Source Document:	American Values In The '80s
Study Note:	Sample Consists Of 1618 Persons Selected Randomly From The General Population, Plus Oversamples Of Blacks, Senior Citizens (65+), And Youths (Aged 14-20). Study Also Contains Responses Of A Leadership Sample
Date of Source Document:	JAN 1981
Subject:	DEFENSE WOMEN

FULL QUESTION ID USRP.AMVAL R527

Question:

R27BA I'm going to read you a list of jobs that people might have in the armed forces. Please tell me whether you think a woman should or should not be assigned to each job, assuming she is trained to do it.... A jet fighter pilot

Responses:

Should	41%
Should not	37
Don't know	2

Survey Organization:	National Opinion Research Center
Population:	National adult
Population Size:	1586
Interview method:	Personal
Beginning date:	FEB 1982
Source Document:	General Social Survey 1982 Supplement
Study Note:	Part Of A Continuing Series Of Social Indicators
	Conducted Since 1972
Date of Source Document:	JUL 1983
Subject:	WOMEN
	DEFENSE

FULL QUESTION ID USNDRC 655825 R27BA

Question:

R2782 (I'm going to read you a list of jobs that people might have in the armed forces. Please tell me whether you think a woman should or should not be assigned to each job, assuming she is trained to do it.)... A truck mechanic

Responses:

Should	82%
Should not	16
Don't know	1

Survey Organization:	National Opinion Research Center
Population:	National adult
Population Size:	1586
Interview method:	Personal
Beginning date:	FEB 1982
Source Document:	General Social Survey 1982 Supplement
Study Note:	Part Of A Continuing Series Of Social Indicators
Conducted Since	1972
Date of Source Document:	JUL 1983
Subject:	WOMEN
	DEFENSE

FULL QUESTION : USNDPC 655825 R2782

Question:

R276C (I'm going to read you a list of jobs that people might have in the armed forces. Please tell me whether you think a woman should or should not be assigned to each job, assuming she is trained to do it.)... A nurse in a combat zone

Responses:

Should	93%
Should not	6
Don't know	1

Survey Organization:	National Opinion Research Center
Population:	National adult
Population Size:	1986
Interview method:	Personal
Beginning date:	FEB 1982
Source Document:	General Social Survey 1982 Supplement
Study Note:	Part Of A Continuing Series Of Social Indicators
	Conducted Since 1972.
Date of Source Document:	JUL 1983
Subject:	WOMEN
	DEFENSE

FULL QUESTION ID USNORC.GSSB25 R276C

Question.

R278D (I'm going to read you a list of jobs that people might have in the armed forces. Please tell me whether you think a woman should or should not be assigned to each job, assuming she is trained to do it.)... A typist in the Pentagon in Washington

Responses:

Should	97%
Should not	2
Don't know	1

Survey Organization:	National Opinion Research Center
Population:	National adult
Population Size:	1586
Interview method:	Personal
Beginning date:	FEB 1982
Ending date:	APR 1982
Source Document:	General Social Survey 1982 Supplement
Study Note:	Part Of A Continuing Series Of Social Indicators
Conducted Since	1972
Date of Source Document:	JUL 1983
Subject:	WOMEN
	DEFENSE

FULL QUESTION ID USNORC GSS82S R278D

Question:

R27BE (I'm going to read you a list of jobs that people might have in the armed forces. Please tell me whether you think a woman should or should not be assigned to each job, assuming she is trained to do it)... Commander of a large military base

Responses:

Should	87%
Should not	4%
Don't know	3%

Survey Organization:	National Opinion Research Center
Population:	National adult
Population Size:	1986
Interview method:	Personal
Beginning date:	FEB 1982
Ending date:	APR 1982
Source Document:	General Social Survey 1982 Supplement
Study Note:	Part Of A Continuing Series Of Social Indicators
Conducted Since	1972
Date of Source Document:	JUL 1983
Subject:	WOMEN
	DEFENSE

FULL QUESTION ID USNOFC G55B25 R27BE

Question:

R27BF (I'm going to read you a list of jobs that people might have in the armed forces. Please tell me whether you think a woman should or should not be assigned to each job, assuming she is trained to do it.)... Soldier in hand-to-hand combat

Responses:

Should	34%
Should not	64
Don't know	3

Survey Organization:	National Opinion Research Center
Population:	National adult
Population Size:	1586
Interview method:	Personal
Beginning date:	FEB 1982
Ending date:	APR 1982
Source Document:	General Social Survey 1982 Supplement
Study Note:	Part Of A Continuing Series Of Social Indicators
Conducted Since	1972
Date of Source Document:	JUL 1983
Subject:	WOMEN
	DEFENSE

FULL QUESTION ID USNORC GSSB25 R27BF

Question:

R2786 (I'm going to read you a list of jobs that people might have in the armed forces. Please tell me whether you think a woman should or should not be assigned to each job, assuming she is trained to do it.)... A jet transport pilot

Responses:

Should	71%
Should not	27
Don't know	2

Survey Organization:	National Opinion Research Center
Population:	National adult
Population Size:	1586
Interview method:	Personal
Beginning date:	FEB 1982
Source Document:	General Social Survey 1982 Supplement
Study Note:	Part Of A Continuing Series Of Social Indicators
	Conducted Since 1972.
Date of Source Document:	JUL 1983
Subject:	WOMEN
	DEFENSE

FULL QUESTION ID USNDRC 655B2E R2786

Question:

R278H (I'm going to read you a list of jobs that people might have in the armed forces. Please tell me whether you think a woman should or should not be assigned to each job, assuming she is trained to do it.)... Air defense missile gunner in the United States

Responses:

Should	57%
Should not	40
Don't know	3

Survey Organization:	National Opinion Research Center	
Population:	National adult	
Population Size:	1506	
Interview method:	Personal	
Beginning date:	FEB 1982	Ending date: APR 1982
Source Document:	General Social Survey 1982 Supplement	
Study Note:	Part Of A Continuing Series Of Social Indicators	
	Conducted Since 1972.	
Date of Source Document:	JUL 1983	
Subject:	WOMEN	
	DEFENSE	

FULL QUESTION ID USNORC 655825 R278H

Question:

R2761 (I'm going to read you a list of jobs that people might have in the armed forces. Please tell me whether you think a woman should or should not be assigned to each job, assuming she is trained to do it.)... A crew member on a combat ship

Responses:

Should	56%
Should not	41
Don't know	3

Survey Organization:	National Opinion Research Center
Population:	National adult
Population Size:	1586
Interview method:	Personal
Beginning date:	FEB 1982
Source Document:	General Social Survey 1982 Supplement
Study Note:	Part Of A Continuing Series Of Social Indicators
Conducted Since	1972.
Date of Source Document:	JUL 1983
Subject:	WOMEN
	DEFENSE

FULL QUESTION ID USNORC 655025 R2701

Question:

R279A As far as you know, are women now assigned to jobs in the armed forces that would expose them to combat, or are women not assigned to such jobs?

Responses:

Yes, they are	22%
No, they are not	85
Don't know	23

Survey Organization:	National Opinion Research Center	
Population:	National adult	
Population Size:	1586	
Interview method:	Personal	
Beginning date:	FEB 1982	Ending date: APR 1982
Source Document:	General Social Survey 1982 Supplement	
Study Note:	Part Of A Continuing Series Of Social Indicators	
Conducted Since 1972.		
Date of Source Document:	JUL 1983	
Subject:	WOMEN	
	DEFENSE	
	INFORMATION	

FULL QUESTION ID USNORC 055825 R279A

Question:

R2793 As far as you know, are women in the armed forces now assigned to dirty jobs like repairing trucks or other heavy equipment, or are women not assigned to such jobs?

Responses:

Yes, they are	49%
No, they are not	24
Don't know	26

Survey Organization:	National Opinion Research Center		
Population:	National adult		
Population Size:	1586		
Interview method:	Personal		
Beginning date:	FEB 1982	Ending date:	APR 1982
Source Document:	General Social Survey 1982 Supplement		
Study Note:	Part Of A Continuing Series Of Social Indicators		
	Conducted Since 1972		
Date of Source Document:	JUL 1983		
Subject:	WOMEN		
	DEFENSE		
	INFORMATION		

FULL QUESTION ID USNDRC 655825 R2793

Question:

R279C As far as you know, are women in the armed forces now assigned to jobs where they have command over men, or are women not assigned to such jobs?

Responses:

Yes, they are	47%
No, they are not	27
Don't know	26

Survey Organization:	National Opinion Research Center
Population:	National adult
Population Size:	1506
Interview method:	Personal
Beginning date:	FEB 1982
Ending date:	APR 1982
Source Document:	General Social Survey 1982 Supplement
Study Note:	Part Of A Continuing Series Of Social Indicators
Conducted Since 1972:	
Date of Source Document:	JUL 1983
Subject:	WOMEN
	DEFENSE
	INFORMATION

FULL QUESTION ID USNDRC GSS82S R279C

Question.

R2R Right now, the United States Armed Forces are staffed only by volunteers. It's been proposed that 18 to 20 year old men and women register for possible military service. Do you think both men and women of those ages should register for possible military service, should only men register, or do you oppose registration?

Responses:

Both men and women	51%
Men only	31
Oppose registration	14
No opinion	4

Survey Organization:	CBS News/New York Times		
Population:	National adult		
Population Size:	1536		
Interview method:	Telephone		
Beginning date:	FEB 13, 1980	Ending date:	FEB 17, 1980
Source Document:	CBS News/New York Times		
Date of Source Document:	FEB 19, 1980		
Subject:	DEFENSE WOMEN		

FULL QUESTION ID USCBSNYT.021980 R2E

.....
Question:

R2 If a draft were to become necessary, should young women be required to participate as well as young men, or not?

Responses:

Should	58%
Should not	47
Don't know	3

Survey Organization:	Gallup Organization
Research Sponsor:	Newsweek
Population:	Young people aged 18 to 24
Population Size:	860
Interview method:	Telephone
Beginning date:	JAN 31, 1980
Source Document:	Gallup/Newsweek
Date of Source Document:	FEB 18, 1980
Subject:	DEFENSE YOUTH WOMEN

FULL QUESTION ID USGALNEW 821880 R2

.....

Question

R5 Would you favor or oppose the registration of the names of all young women under these circumstances (so that in the event of an emergency the time needed to call up people for a draft would be reduced)?

Responses:

Favor	51%
Oppose	44
Don't know	5

Survey Organization:	Gallup Organization
Research Sponsor:	Newsweek
Population:	Young people aged 18 to 24
Population Size:	568
Interview method:	Telephone
Beginning date:	JAN 31, 1980
Source Document:	Gallup/Newsweek
Date of Source Document:	FEB 18, 1980
Subject:	DEFENSE YOUTH WOMEN

FULL QUESTION ID USGALNEW 021080 R5

Question:

Q89E If a draft were to become necessary, should young women be required to participate as well as young men, or not?

Responses:

Should	51%
Should not	45
No Opinion	4

Survey Organization:	Gallup Organization	
Population:	National adult	
Population Size:	1584	
Interview method:	Personal	
Beginning date:	FEB 1, 1980	Ending date: FEB 4, 1980
Source Document:	Gallup Poll-Aipo	
Date of Source Document:	FEB 4, 1980	
Subject:	DEFENSE	
	WOMEN	

FULL QUESTION ID. USGALLUP.114B Q89E

.....

Question:

Q39H Would you favor or oppose the registration of the names of all young women under these circumstances (so that in the event of an emergency the time needed to call people up for a draft would be reduced)?

Responses:

Favor	55%
Oppose	40
No Opinion	4

Survey Organization:	Gallup Organization	
Population:	National adult	
Population Size:	1584	
Interview method:	Personal	
Beginning date:	FEB 1, 1980	Ending date: FEB 4, 1980
Source Document:	Gallup Poll-Aigo	
Date of Source Document:	FEB 4, 1980	
Subject:	DEFENSE	
	WOMEN	

FULL QUESTION ID USGALLUP.1148.Q39H

Question:

Q227B If a draft were to become necessary, should young women be required to participate as well as young men, or not?

Responses:

Should	49%
Should not	47
No Opinion	4

Survey Organization:	Gallup Organization	
Population:	National adult	
Population Size:	1548	
Interview method:	Personal	
Beginning date:	JUL 11, 1980	Ending date: JUL 14, 1980
Source Document:	Gallup Poll-Aipo	
Date of Source Document:	JUL 14, 1980	
Subject:	DEFENSE	
	WOMEN	

FULL QUESTION ID: USGALLUP.1159.Q007B

Question:

QDC7E Do you favor or oppose the registration of the names of all young women under these circumstances (so that in the event of a emergency the time needed to call up people for a draft would be reduced.)

Responses:

Favor	49%
Oppose	45
No Opinion	6

Survey Organization:	Gallup Organization		
Population:	National adult		
Population Size:	1548		
Interview method:	Personal		
Beginning date:	JUL 11, 1980	Ending date:	JUL 14, 1980
Source Document:	Gallup Poll-Aipo		
Date of Source Document:	JUL 14, 1980		
Subject:	DEFENSE		
	WOMEN		

FULL QUESTION ID. USGALLUP.1159.QDC7E

.....

Question:

Q05 Do you approve or disapprove of the Supreme Court ruling that women cannot be drafted?

Responses:

Yes, approve	59%
No, disapprove	36
Don't know	6

Survey Organization:	Gallup Organization
Population:	National adult
Population Size:	1516
Interview method:	Personal
Beginning date:	JUL 31, 1981
Ending date:	AUG 3, 1981
Source Document:	Gallup Poll-Aipo
Date of Source Document:	AUG 3, 1981
Subject:	DEFENSE
	WOMEN

FULL QUESTION ID. USGALLUP.1180 Q05

Question:

R2 Recently, the U S. Supreme Court ruled that all women are exempt from military registration. Do you favor or oppose exempting women from military registration?

Responses:

Favor	49%
Oppose	48
Not sure	3

Survey Organization:	Louis Harris & Associates	
Population:	National adult	
Population Size:	1248	
Interview method:	Telephone	
Beginning date:	AUG 11, 1981	Ending date: AUG 16, 1981
Source Document:	Harris Survey	
Date of Source Document:	SEP 24, 1981	
Subject:	DEFENSE	
	WOMEN	
	COURTS	

FULL QUESTION ID USHARRIS 892481.R2

Question:

R16 If there is to be a registration of 18 to 26 year olds, do you think it is right that both men and women be registered or only men?

Responses:

Both men and women	49%
Only men	37
Women but not for combat forces (val.)	11
Don't know	3

Survey Organization:	Roper Organization	
Population:	National adult	
Population Size:	2001	
Interview method:	Personal	
Beginning date:	FEB 9, 1980	Ending date: FEB 23, 1980
Source Document:	Roper Report 80-3	
Date of Source Document:	APR 1980	
Subject:	DEFENSE	
	MEN	
	WOMEN	

FULL QUESTION ID. USROPER 80-3 R16

Question:

R295A If we should return to a military draft at this time, should young women be drafted as well as young men, or not?

Subpopulation: Think we should return to draft (42%)

Responses:

Should	83%
Should not	44
Don't know	3

Survey Organization:	National Opinion Research Center
Population:	National adult
Population Size:	1506
Interview method:	Personal
Beginning date:	FEB 1982
Source Document:	General Social Survey 1982 Supplement
Study Note:	Part Of A Continuing Series Of Social Indicators
Conducted Since 1972:	
Date of Source Document:	JUL 1983
Subject:	DEFENSE
	WOMEN

FULL QUESTION ID USNOFC 055825 R295A

.....

Question:

R295C If we should return to a military draft in a national emergency, should young women be drafted as well as young men, or not?

Subpopulation. See note

Responses

Should	53%
Should not	43
Don't know	4

Asked of those who originally said we should continue to rely on volunteers or Don't know, but who said that if there were a national emergency we should return to the draft (47%)

Survey Organization:	National Opinion Research Center
Population:	National adult
Population Size:	1586
Interview method:	Personal
Beginning date:	FEB 1982
Source Document:	General Social Survey 1982 Supplement
Study Note:	Part Of A Continuing Series Of Social Indicators
Conducted Since 1972:	
Date of Source Document:	JUL 1982
Subject:	DEFENSE
	WOMEN

FULL QUESTION ID USNOFC G5EE25 R295C

.....
Question:

R2B1A (Asked of those who think we should return to a military draft at this time) If we should return to a military draft at this time, should young women be drafted as well as young men, or not?

Subpopulation: Should return to military draft

Responses:

Young women should be drafted	46%
Should not	51.
• Don't know	2

Asked of those who think we should return to a military draft at this time = 29%

Survey Organization:	National Opinion Research Center
Population:	National Adult
Population Size:	1599
Interview method:	Personal Interview
Beginning date:	FEB 1983
Ending date:	APR 1983
Source Document:	General Social Survey 1983
Study Note:	Part Of A Continuing Series Of Social Indicators
Conducted Since	1972
Date of Source Document:	JUL 1983
Subject:	DEFENSE
	WOMEN

FULL QUESTION ID USNORC.GS5B3 R2B1A

Question:

R2B1C (Asked of those who don't know if we should return to a military draft and those who think we should continue to rely on volunteers who also favored a military draft if there were a national emergency) If we should return to a military draft in a national emergency, should young women be drafted as well as young men, or not?

Subpopulation: Favor military draft in national emergency.

Responses:

Young women should be drafted	58%
Should not	47
Don't know	3

Respondents who don't know if we should return to a military draft and those who think we should continue to rely on volunteers who also favored returning to a draft if there were a national emergency = 58%

Survey Organization:	National Opinion Research Center		
Population:	National Adult		
Population Size:	1999		
Interview method:	Personal Interview		
Beginning date:	FEB 1983	Ending date:	APR 1983
Source Document:	General Social Survey 1983		
Study Note	Part Of A Continuing Series Of Social Indicators		
Conducted Since 1972			
Date of Source Document	JUL 1983		
Subject	DEFENSE		
	WOMEN		

FULL QUESTION ID USNDRC G65E3 R2B1C

Question

R295A If we should return to a military draft at this time, should young women be drafted as well as young men, or not?

Subpopulation: Think we should return to draft (23%)

Responses:

Should	49%
Should not	49
Don't know	2

Survey Organization:	National Opinion Research Center
Population:	National adult
Population Size:	1473
Interview method:	Personal
Beginning date:	FEB 1984
Source Document:	General Social Survey 1984 Supplement
Study Note:	Part Of A Continuing Series Of Social Indicators
	Conducted Since 1972
Date of Source Document:	JUL 1985
Subject:	DEFENSE
	WOMEN

FULL QUESTION ID USNORC 655845 R295A

Question:

R295C If we should return to a military draft in a national emergency, should young women be drafted as well as young men, or not?

Subpopulation: See note

Responses:

Should	51%
Should not	46
Don't know	2

Asked of those who originally said we should continue to rely on volunteers or Don't know, but who said that if there were a national emergency we should return to the draft (42%)

Survey Organization:	National Opinion Research Center
Population:	National adult
Population Size:	1473
Interview method:	Personal
Beginning date:	FEB 1984
Source Document:	General Social Survey 1984 Supplement
Study Note:	Part Of A Continuing Series Of Social Indicators
	Conducted Since 1972
Date of Source Document:	JUL 1985
Subject:	DEFENSE
	WOMEN

FULL QUESTION ID USNORC 055045 R295C

Question:

RQ3 Do you favor or oppose drafting women into the armed forces?

Responses:

Favor	44%
Oppose	45
Favor, non-combat positions only (Vol.)	6
Not sure	5

Survey Organization:	NBC News/Associated Press
Population:	National adult
Population Size:	1599
Interview method:	Telephone
Beginning date:	JAN 29, 1980
Ending date:	JAN 30, 1980
Source Document:	NBC News/Associated Press
Date of Source Document:	FEB 5, 1980
Subject:	DEFENSE
	WOMEN

FULL QUESTION ID. USNBCAP.52B.RQ3

Question:

R14 Do you favor or oppose drafting women into the armed forces?

Responses:

Favor	41%
Oppose	54
Not sure	4

Survey Organization:	NBC News/Associated Press
Population:	National adult
Population Size:	2411
Interview method:	Telephone
Beginning date:	JAN 21, 1981
Ending date:	JAN 23, 1981
Source Document:	NBC News/Associated Press
Date of Source Document:	JAN 1981
Subject:	DEFENSE
	WOMEN

FULL QUESTION ID: USNBCAP.81JAN.R14

Question:

R36 If a draft were reinstated, would you favor or oppose drafting women as well as men?

Responses:

Favor drafting women	43%
Oppose drafting women	52
Oppose drafting anybody (vol)	1
Not sure	4

Survey Organization: NBC News/Associated Press
Population: National adult
Population Size: 1999
Interview method: Telephone
Beginning date: JUL 13, 1981 Ending date: JUL 14, 1981
Source Document: NBC News/Associated Press
Date of Source Document: JUL 24, 1981
Subject: DEFENSE
WOMEN

FULL QUESTION ID USNBCAP 48 R36

.....

Question.

R03 Do you favor or oppose all women being registered for the draft and then being subject to the draft later on?

Responses:

Favor	65%
Oppose	42
Not sure	3

Survey Organization:	ABC News/Louis Harris And Associates
Population:	Likely voters
Population Size:	1196
Interview method:	Telephone
Beginning date:	JAN 31, 1968
Ending date:	FEB 4, 1968
Source Document:	ABC News/Harris Survey
Date of Source Document:	MAR 7, 1968
Subject:	DEFENSE WOMEN

FULL QUESTION ID USABCHS 030700 R03

.....
Question:
R3 Do you favor or oppose women being registered for the draft on the same basis as men and then being subject to the draft later on?

Responses:
Favor 53%
Oppose 44
Not sure 3

Survey Organization: ABC News/Louis Harris And Associates
Population: Likely voters
Population Size: 1195
Interview method: Telephone
Beginning date: AUG 1, 1988 Ending date: AUG 3, 1988
Source Document: ABC News/Harris Survey
Date of Source Document: AUG 18, 1988
Subject: DEFENSE
WOMEN

FULL QUESTION ID: USABCHS 001020 R3

Question.

R26 If young men are drafted, do you think women should be drafted too, or not?

Responses.

Yes, should be	45%
No, should not be	54
No opinion	2

Survey Organization: ABC News/Washington Post
Population: National adult
Population Size: 1586
Interview method: Telephone
Beginning date: MAR 21, 1985 Ending date: MAR 23, 1985
Source Document: ABC News/Washington Post
Date of Source Document: MAR 31, 1985
Subject:

DEFENSE
WOMEN

FULL QUESTION ID. USABCNP.186 R26

.....
Question:
Q48 Would you favor or oppose requiring all young women give one year of service to the nation--either in the military forces or in non-military work here or abroad, such as work in hospitals or with elderly people?

Responses.	54%
Favor	48
Oppose	6
No Opinion	

Survey Organization:	Gallup Organization
Population:	National adult
Population Size:	1515
Interview method:	Personal
Beginning date:	JUN 9, 1981
Source Document:	Gallup Poll-Aiso
Date of Source Document:	JUN 8, 1981
Subject:	DEFENSE WOMEN

FULL QUESTION ID: USGALLUP.1174.Q48

.....
Question.
04D Suppose all young women were required to give one year of service,
which would you prefer--military or non-military?

Responses:	18%
Military	47
Non-military	15
No Opinion	

Survey Organization:	Gallup Organization
Population:	National adult
Population Size:	1515
Interview method:	Personal
Beginning date:	JUN 9, 1981
Source Document:	Gallup Poll-Aips
Date of Source Document:	JUN 8, 1981
Subject:	DEFENSE WOMEN

FULL QUESTION ID. USGALLUP.1174.04D

Question.
R3 Would you favor or oppose such a program for young women (requiring all young women to give one year of service to the nation, either in the military forces or in non-military work here or abroad, such as VISTA (Volunteers in Service to America), the Peace Corps, or in a local community or city service program)?

Responses: 44%
Favor 56
Oppose/No opinion

Survey Organization: Gallup Organization
Population: National adult
Population Size: 1549
Interview method: Personal
Beginning date: DEC 4, 1987 Ending date: DEC 7, 1987
Source Document: Gallup Poll
Date of Source Document: JAN 24, 1988
Subject: DEFENSE
PARTICIPATION
WOMEN

FULL QUESTION ID. USGALLUP.012488 R3

Question.

R5 (It's been suggested that instead of a military draft, all young men between 18 and 26 must serve two years in service for their country, including work with the Peace Corps overseas, work with poverty groups and the handicapped at home, or on environmental cleanup, as well as military service. Each young man would have to serve one year in the military and the other year either in another type service or in the military. I Would you favor or oppose having young women between 18 and 26 serve in the same universal service program?

Responses:	91%
Favor	47
Oppose	2
Not sure	

Survey Organization:	Louis Harris & Associates
Population:	National adult
Population Size:	1248
Interview method:	Telephone
Beginning date:	AUG 11, 1981
Source Document:	Harris Survey
Date of Source Document:	SEP 24, 1981
Subject:	DEFENSE WOMEN

FULL QUESTION ID USHARRIS 092461 R5

.....

Question:
 R268A How would you feel about a program that required all young women to give one year of service to the nation--either in the military forces or in non-military work such as hospitals or with elderly people--would you strongly favor it, probably favor it, probably oppose it, or strongly oppose it?

Responses:	27%
Strongly favor	34
Probably favor	22
Probably oppose	15
Strongly oppose	3
Don't know	

Survey Organization:	National Opinion Research Center
Population:	National adult
Population Size:	1986
Interview method:	Personal
Beginning date:	FEB 1982
Source Document:	General Social Survey 1982 Supplement
Study Note	Part Of A Continuing Series Of Social Indicators
Conducted Since 1972	
Date of Source Document:	JUL 1983
Subject	DEFENSE
	WOMEN

FULL QUESTION: ID USNDPC GSSE25 P268A

Question:

R268A How would you feel about a program that required all young women to give one year of service to the nation--either in the military forces or in non-military work such as in hospitals or with elderly people--would you strongly favor it, probably favor it, probably oppose it, or strongly oppose it?

Responses:

Strongly favor	23%
Probably favor	38
Probably oppose	22
Strongly oppose	15
Don't know	2

Survey Organization:	National Opinion Research Center
Population:	National adult
Population Size:	1473
Interview method:	Personal
Beginning date:	FEB 1984
Source Document:	General Social Survey 1984 Supplement
Study Note:	Part Of A Continuing Series Of Social Indicators
Conducted Since	1972
Date of Source Document:	JUL 1985
Subject:	DEFENSE
	WOMEN

FULL QUESTION ID USNORC 655845 R268A

.....

Question:
Q06H Do you feel women are discriminated against or not in... Obtaining
top jobs in the military services?

Responses:	
Male responses/	.
Discriminated against	46%
Male responses/	.
Not discriminated against	39
Male responses/	.
Don't Know	15
Female responses/	.
Discriminated against	42
Female responses/	.
Not discriminated against	34
Female responses/	.
Don't Know	23

Survey Organization:	Roper Organization
Research Sponsor:	Virginia Slins
Population:	National--Men and Women (see note)
Population Size:	4000
Interview method	Personal
Beginning date	MAR 1, 1985
Source Document	Ending date: MAR 30, 1985
Study Note:	Virginia Slins American Women's Poll 1985
	The Sample Consisted Of 1000 Men And 3000 Women
	Male And Female Responses Are Shown Here Separately Under Each Question
Date of Source Document	MAR 1985
Subject	WOMEN
	EQUALITY
	DEFENSE

FULL QUESTION ID USROPER B5VASEL Q06H

.....

Question:

R2988 And what about women? Would you say that their treatment and opportunities are better in the military, better in civilian employment, or that there isn't any difference these days?

Responses:

Better in the military	18%
Better in civilian employment	33
No difference	43
Don't know	6

Survey Organization:	National Opinion Research Center	
Population:	National adult	
Population Size:	1473	
Interview method:	Personal	
Beginning date:	FEB 1984	Ending date: APR 1984
Source Document:	General Social Survey 1984 Supplement	
Study Note:	Part Of A Continuing Series Of Social Indicators	
	Conducted Since 1972	
Date of Source Document:	JUL 1985	
Subject:	DEFENSE	
	WOMEN	

FULL QUESTION ID USNOFC GSSB45 R2953

.....

Question:

R3002 How about for most young women, do you think military service is definitely a good experience, probably a good experience, probably not a good experience, or definitely not a good experience for them?

Responses:

Definitely good	14%
Probably good	56
Probably not good	20
Definitely not good	7
Don't know	4

Survey Organization:	National Opinion Research Center
Population:	National adult
Population Size:	1473
Interview method:	Personal
Beginning date:	FEB 1984
Ending date:	APR 1984
Source Document:	General Social Survey 1984 Supplement
Study Note:	Part Of A Continuing Series Of Social Indicators
Conducted Since	1972
Date of Source Document:	JUL 1985
Subject	DEFENSE
	WOMEN

FULL QUESTION ID USNOFC GESB45 R3002

Question:

R3081 (We all know that American citizens have certain rights. For example, they have the right to free public education and to police protection, the right to attend religious services of their choice, and the right to elect public officials. I'd like to ask now about certain obligations that some people feel American citizens owe their country. I just want your own opinion on these--whether you feel it is a very important obligation, a somewhat important obligation, or not an obligation that a citizen owes to the country. . . . For young women, serving in the military during peacetime?

Responses:

Very important	24%
Somewhat important	56
Not an obligation	31
Don't know	1

Survey Organization:	National Opinion Research Center
Population:	National adult
Population Size:	1473
Interview method:	Personal
Beginning date:	FEB 1984
Ending date:	APR 1984
Source Document:	General Social Survey 1984 Supplement
Study Note:	Part Of A Continuing Series Of Social Indicators
Conducted Since 1972	
Date of Source Document	JUL 1985
Subject:	PATRIOTISM
	PARTICIPATION
	DEFENSE
	WOMEN

FULL QUESTION ID USNDRC 655645 R3081

Question:

R306J (We all know that American citizens have certain rights. For example, they have the right to free public education and to police protection, the right to attend religious services of their choice, and the right to elect public officials. I'd like to ask now about certain obligations that some people feel American citizens owe their country. I just want your own opinion on these--whether you feel it is a very important obligation, a somewhat important obligation, or not an obligation that a citizen owes to the country)... For young women, serving in the military when the country is at war?

Responses:

Very important	44%
Somewhat important	37
Not an obligation	16
Don't know	3

Survey Organization:	National Opinion Research Center
Population:	National adult
Population Size:	1473
Interview Method:	Personal
Beginning date:	FEB 1984
Source Document:	General Social Survey 1984 Supplement
Study Note:	Part Of A Continuing Series Of Social Indicators
Conducted Since:	1972
Date of Source Document:	JUL 1985
Subject:	PATRIOTISM PARTICIPATION DEFENSE WOMEN WAR

FULL QUESTION ID USNOFC 655645 R306J

Question:

R6 (Here are some things people have said might happen when the Equal Rights Amendment is passed. For each, I'd like to know if you personally feel it will be more likely to happen because of the Equal Rights Amendment or not?)... Women will be drafted to serve in combat.

Responses:

More likely	46%
Not more likely	51
Already happened (vel)	*
* Not sure	3
* = less than .5 percent	

Survey Organization:	Louis Harris & Associates	
Population:	National Adult	
Population Size:	1258	
Interview method:	Telephone	
Beginning date:	APR 16, 1982	Ending date: APR 22, 1982
Source Document:	Harris Survey	
Date of Source Document:	MAY 6, 1982	
Subject:	WOMEN DEFENSE	

FULL QUESTION ID USHARRIS 030602 R6

.....

Question:

RB1 Let me read you some things people have said might happen if the Equal Rights Amendment were passed. For each, I'd like to know if you personally feel that will be more likely to happen because of the Equal Rights Amendment, or not?...Moehn will be drafted to serve in combat.

Responses:

More likely to happen	38%
Not more likely to happen	58
Already happens (vol)	*
* Not sure	4
* = less than .5 percent	

Survey Organization:	Louis Harris & Associates
Research Sponsor:	Business Week
Population:	National Adult
Population Size:	1253
Interview method:	Telephone
Beginning date:	JUN 15, 1983
Source Document:	Business Week/Harris Poll
Date of Source Document:	AUG 1, 1983
Subject:	WOMEN
	DEFENSE

FULL QUESTION ID USHARRBW 080183 RB1

Question:

Q071 Now I'm going to read you a list of words and phrases. For each one, would you tell me if you associate it more with a WOMAN running for public office or more with a MAN running for public office? Supports arms control.

Responses:

Woman	23%
Man	54
No difference (Vol.)	20
Don't Know	4

Survey Organization:	Roper Organization
Research Sponsor:	U.S. News and World Report
Population:	National adult
Population Size:	1820
Interview method:	Telephone
Beginning date:	OCT 21, 1986
Source Document:	Roper/U.S. News And World Report
Date of Source Document:	OCT 23, 1986
Subject:	DEFENSE DIPLOMACY ELECTIONS MEN WOMEN

FULL QUESTION ID. USRPER 744023 Q071

APPENDIX B

ITEMS FROM THE 1990 SURVEY OF HIGH SCHOOL YOUTH AND PARENTS

A. Currently, women are restricted by law and policy from military duties involving combat. What is your opinion about changing the law so that women would be allowed to volunteer for combat assignments? Would you...

Favor such a change..... —
Neither favor nor oppose such a change... —
Oppose such a change..... —
Don't know..... —

B. If the Army permitted women to volunteer for combat assignments, how likely would you be to serve in the Army?

Definitely..... —
Probably..... —
Probably not..... —
Definitely not..... —

The U.S. Army Recruiting Command (USAREC) is conducting a survey on the topic of women in combat. You have been randomly selected to participate in this survey. Your answers are confidential and will have no effect on you as an individual. Only group information will be reported.

Changing these regulations could expose more women soldiers to combat risks, but it could also allow more women soldiers to receive incentives and perhaps faster promotions. Most combat MOSs (in Armor, Field Artillery, and Infantry) have some incentives for enlisting. These can include two-year enlistments, cash bonuses of \$1500 to \$8000, or Army College Fund incentives of up to \$14,400.

Until now, women have always been excluded from the combat MOSs, so we do not have much information on people's opinions about women in combat. Therefore, we would like to find out what you think about this topic.

Please mark your answers directly on this form.

- C-1

For questions 7-11, suppose that women were allowed to enlist for combat MOSs.

7. Would it make any difference in your decision to enlist in the Army?
- ☐ Yes
 - ☐ No Go to question 9
 - ☐ Not sure Go to question 9
8. If you answered "Yes" to question 7, please explain how your enlistment decision would be affected (mark only one):
- ☐ I would not enlist at all.
 - ☐ I would enlist in a different service that still excluded women from combat MOSs.
 - ☐ I would enlist in the Army, but only for an MOS with a low probability of direct combat involvement.
 - ☐ I would enlist in the Army for a combat MOS.
9. Would you have enlisted in a combat MOS (mark all that apply):
- ☐ for 3 years even if no special incentive were offered?
 - ☐ for 3 years for a cash enlistment bonus of _____?
 - ☐ for 4 years for a cash enlistment bonus of _____?
 - ☐ for 2 years even if no other special incentive were offered?
 - ☐ for 2 years for a total GI Bill and Army College Fund educational incentive of _____?
 - ☐ for 3 years for a total GI Bill and Army College Fund educational incentive of _____?
 - ☐ for 4 years for a total GI Bill and Army College Fund educational incentive of _____?
 - ☐ I would not enlist for a combat MOS regardless of any special incentives.
10. Do you think your family would be more in favor of your enlistment or more opposed to it?
- ☐ More in favor
 - ☐ It would make no difference
 - ☐ More opposed
11. How likely is it that after your enlistment you would reenlist?
- ☐ Definitely
 - ☐ Probably
 - ☐ Probably Not
 - ☐ Definitely Not
 - ☐ Don't Know

Under current regulations, soldiers can be assigned duties in other MOSs when required to fulfill Army missions. This means that all men, regardless of MOS, can be assigned to combat units or roles if ever required.

12. Should women in the Army be required to take direct combat roles as men are, or should they be given combat roles only if they volunteer for them?
- ☐ Required to take combat roles the same as men
 - ☐ Only if they volunteer
 - ☐ Women should not be eligible for combat roles
 - ☐ Don't know

For questions 13-17, suppose that women were required to take direct combat roles as men are.

13. Would it make any difference in your decision to enlist in the Army?
- ☐ Yes
 - ☐ No Go to question 15
 - ☐ Not sure Go to question 15
14. If you answered "Yes" to question 13, please explain how your enlistment decision would be affected (mark only one):
- ☐ I would not enlist at all.
 - ☐ I would enlist in a different service that still excluded women from combat MOSs.
 - ☐ I would enlist in the Army, but only for an MOS with a low probability of direct combat involvement.
 - ☐ I would enlist in the Army for a combat MOS.
15. Would you have enlisted in a combat MOS (mark all that apply):
- ☐ for 3 years even if no special incentive were offered?
 - ☐ for 3 years for a cash enlistment bonus of _____?
 - ☐ for 4 years for a cash enlistment bonus of _____?
 - ☐ for 2 years even if no other special incentive were offered?
 - ☐ for 2 years for a total GI Bill and Army College Fund educational incentive of _____?
 - ☐ for 3 years for a total GI Bill and Army College Fund educational incentive of _____?
 - ☐ for 4 years for a total GI Bill and Army College Fund educational incentive of _____?
 - ☐ I would not enlist for a combat MOS regardless of any special incentives.
16. Do you think your family would be more in favor of your enlistment or more opposed to it?
- ☐ More in favor
 - ☐ It would make no difference
 - ☐ More opposed
17. How likely is it that after your enlistment you would reenlist?
- ☐ Definitely
 - ☐ Probably
 - ☐ Probably Not
 - ☐ Definitely Not
 - ☐ Don't Know

18. Even though women are excluded from combat by policy, several women were involved in combat situations during operations in Panama last December. What effect, if any, have recent events in Panama had on your opinion?

- ☐ Now I am more in favor of ending the combat exclusion for women.
- ☐ Events in Panama have not affected my opinion.
- ☐ Now I am more in favor of keeping the combat exclusion for women.

19. Imagine that you could create your own "ideal" job or position. Please indicate how important you feel each of the following items is for your image of the ideal job.

Extremely important
Very important
Somewhat important
Not very important
Not at all important

- | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| a. Opportunities for advancement | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| b. Good salary/benefits | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| c. Interesting job content | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| d. Getting along with co-workers | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| e. High job position | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| f. Personal recognition | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| g. Helping others | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| h. Status of profession or firm | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| i. Pleasant work environment | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| j. Job security | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| k. Time for spouse/family | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| l. Time for leisure activities | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| m. Job responsibility | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| n. Desirable geographic location | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| o. Fits with existing experience | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| p. Gain new experience | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| q. Opportunity to travel | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| r. Ability to work on one's own | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| s. Being creative | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| t. Supervising others | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| u. Regular routine in time/place | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| v. Feeling of accomplishment | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| w. Clear-cut procedures to follow | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

20. Think about yourself in a work situation. For each adjective below, please indicate how descriptive it is of you at work.

Extremely descriptive
Very descriptive
Somewhat descriptive
Not very descriptive
Not at all descriptive

- | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| a. Personable | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| b. Outgoing | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| c. Precise | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| d. Conservative | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| e. Creative | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| f. Team worker | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| g. Problem solver | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| h. Image conscious | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| i. Future oriented | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| j. Masculine | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| k. Help others | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| l. Independent | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| m. Mathematical | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| n. Logical | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| o. Technically oriented | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| p. Attractive | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| q. Hard working | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| r. Mechanically oriented | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| s. Like structured environment | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| t. Unconventional | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| u. Work well under pressure | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| v. Young | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| w. Energetic | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| x. Intelligent | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| y. Family oriented | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| z. Feminine | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

For questions 21-24, assume that Army policies were changed to allow women to enlist for combat MOSs, but not require them to take direct combat roles if they were in non-combat MOSs.

21. To what extent would women in combat positions have these opportunities?

22. To what extent would women in non-combat positions have these opportunities?

	Not at all				To a great extent
a. Opportunities for advancement	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
b. Good salary/benefits	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
c. Interesting job content	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
d. Getting along with co-workers	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
e. High job position	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
f. Personal recognition	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
g. Helping others	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
h. Status of profession or firm	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
i. Pleasant work environment	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
j. Job security	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
k. Time for spouse/family	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
l. Time for leisure activities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
m. Job responsibility	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
n. Desirable geographic location	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
o. Fits with existing experience	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
p. Gain new experience	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
q. Opportunity to travel	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
r. Ability to work on one's own	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
s. Being creative	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
t. Supervising others	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
u. Regular routine in time/place	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
v. Feeling of accomplishment	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
w. Clear-cut procedures to follow	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

[illegible]

23. To what extent do the following adjectives describe the typical woman who would enlist in a combat MOS?

24. To what extent do the following adjectives describe the typical woman who would enlist in a non-combat MOS?

	Not at all				Very much
a. Personable	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
b. Outgoing	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
c. Precise	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
d. Conservative	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
e. Creative	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
f. Team worker	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
g. Problem solver	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
h. Image conscious	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
i. Future oriented	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
j. Masculine	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
k. Helps others	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
l. Independent	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
m. Mathematical	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
n. Logical	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
o. Technically oriented	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
p. Attractive	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
q. Hard working	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
r. Mechanically oriented	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
s. Likes structured environment	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
t. Unconventional	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
u. Works well under pressure	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
v. Young	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
w. Energetic	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
x. Intelligent	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
y. Family oriented	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
z. Feminine	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

[illegible]